National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ACCUMULATION OF WEALTH AND POWER IN THE COURT OF EDWARD III: The Career of Alice Perrers, 1362-1377

BY

James S. Bothwell

(C)

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE

STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1991

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70247-8

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: James S. Bothwell

TITLE OF THESIS: The Accumulation of Wealth and Power in the Court of Edward III: The Career of Alice Perrers, 1362-1377

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1991

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

James Bothwell

8212-148 Street

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

T5R 0Z4

Date: 17 September 1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **THE ACCUMULATION OF WEALTH AND POWER IN THE COURT OF EDWARD III: The Career of Alice Perrers, 1362-1377** submitted by James S. Bothwell in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

J.L. Langdon
(Supervisor)

C.M. Small

S. Reimer

K.J. Munro

Date: 17 September 1991

DEDICATION

To my family,
for their constant support,

and

to Cindy,
who kept me sane during a summer of thesis writing

ABSTRACT

The role of royal mistress in the Middle Ages was a passive one. Her position, her wealth, and even her fate were dependent upon the will of the king. In essence she was there simply for the king's pleasure and was dependent on his goodwill.

There is, however, at least one glaring exception to this statement. Alice Perrers, the mistress of King Edward III, transcended this concept of role early on in her career to become one of the most wealthy and powerful women in Fourteenth Century England. Moreover, she did this without the aid of the king. Most of her wealth was instead gained by her own wiles, in part by using her status as an active ingredient in her accumulation of wealth but mainly by the use of a determined business sense. By concentrating on a large body of documentation found in the published documents of the Public Record Office in London, this thesis is an examination of Alice Perrers' methods and strategies in her career as king's mistress. Not only will this show what it took for a woman to rise through the ranks in English society, but it will also uncover much about the accumulation of wealth and power in the later Middle Ages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to recognize the following people for their contribution to the ensuing pages. A special thank you must go to my supervisor, Professor John Langdon, without whose knowledge, encouragement, and incredible patience this thesis would never have been completed. I would also like to thank Mary Stares, a comrade in arms, whose help and advice was instumental in all aspects of the present volume. Last but not least, I would like to thank certain individuals whose friendship these last two years has been invaluable: Elaine Frank, Sherry Fulton and her son, Michael.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I Introduction 1

i) Thesis Statement

ii) Source Material

iii) Historiography

iv) Organization

Chapter II Royal Patronage to Alice Perrers 14

i) Land and Other Material Grants

ii) Loans and Other Monetary Gifts

iii) Influence

Chapter III Acquisitions by Alice Perrers 33

i) Land and Other Material Grants

ii) Loans and Other Monetary Gifts

iii) Influence

Chapter IV Patronage to Others 55

i) Land and Other Material Grants

ii) Loans and Other Monetary Gifts

iii) Influence

Chapter V Summary/Conclusions 70

i) Summary

ii) Conclusions

Bibliography 76

Appendix One Geographical Distribution 82

Appendix Two Manorial Holdings 85

Appendix Three Index of Citations 89

ABBREVIATIONS

AD	Ancient Deeds
CCR	Calendar of Close Rolls
CCharR	Calendar of Charter Rolls
CFR	Calendar of Fines Rolls
CIM	Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous
CIPM	Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem
CPR	Calendar of Patent Rolls
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
FA	Feudal Aids
RP	Rolls of Parliament
VCH	Victoria County History

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

i) Thesis Statement

In the Middle Ages, to be a royal favourite of either gender was to chance being both in a position of power and a situation of vulnerability. While royal favour endured, the potential attitude of the preferred individual may be viewed as existing on a psychological spectrum bounded at one end by passive existence based on the monarch's approval or affection and at the other by an active use of his or her own position in order to procure further self advancement.

But while the status of royal favourite itself was sexless, the actual opportunities open to the individual were definitely limited by gender. Indeed, a male was obviously more aptly suited both legally and socially to exploit and thrive in this environment. Not only was he free to rise to such a situation by way of his professional aptitude and retain that position by camaraderie with the king, a male could also make himself an indispensible part of the government as a whole. The medieval period is full of male royal favourites who increased their own wealth and status by their service as well as their relations to the king - for example, William I's group of favoured fellow invaders whom he made into the nobility of England, Henry II's men of ability such as William Marshall, and Edward I's warrior friends.

Male favourites could justify their position through the time honoured roles of royal companions and servants. When it came to making account of herself, however, it was more

difficult for a female courtier to argue her usefulness. For if a male courtier was sometimes distant from the wise and natural counsellors so often called for in times of disaffection with royal policy, a female courtier, because of her gender, was completely ineligible. Moreover, in her personal relations with the king, a female was obviously much more susceptible to the charge of degrading the royal person - no small crime, considering that the person of the king was considered the linchpin of medieval society. Hence, the female favourite was often a passive and discreet individual, well cognizant of her role in life.

In terms of background, royal mistresses came from the middle ranks of society, usually, according to Given-Wilson and Curteis in their The Royal Bastards of Medieval England, from the "lesser land owning class" or the "civic bourgeois."[1] Their reason for the choice of this social level was that

> . . . they were, so to speak, safe: not too low born, not too high born. Their future marriage prospects were unlikely to be affected by the knowledge of a royal liaison, as might be the case with a great heiress; whereas unlike genuinely low-born women, they at least had the opportunity to meet the king.[2]

Henry I's Ansfride, Edith and Sybil, Henry II's Rosamund and Nest, as well Edward IV's Elizabeth Wayte all came from this level of society.[3]

This being the case, most medieval kings did not hesitate to have mistresses at their disposal.[4] Indeed, by this method, they could temporarily relieve the stresses of marriages which were often not primarily for the sake of affection. But the fact is that mistresses were

---

[1]Chris Given-Wilson and Alice Curteis, The Royal Bastards of Medieval England (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 13.

[2]Given-Wilson and Curteis, Royal Bastards, p. 13.

[3]Given-Wilson and Curteis, Royal Bastards, p. 13.

[4]Over half of the kings in the period 1066-1485 can be positively proven to have had mistresses. Given-Wilson and Curteis, Royal Bastards, pp. 8-12.

meant to be a temporary measure almost by definition and certainly by practice. Only two were to become permanent attachments to their royal lovers. One, Elizabeth Shore, daughter of a London merchant and later the mistress of Edward IV, stayed with the king for a number of years, but in terms of her historical reputation, she was generally well liked because she seemed to know the limits of her station.[5]

The other royal mistress of any durability, Alice Perrers, started off with the background of a typical king's mistress. Though she may have indeed come from the family of a tiler of Hanneye in Essex, as one hostile chronicler had stated,[6] most scholars now accept that she was connected with the lesser gentry, perhaps of the Perrers family of Hertfordshire.[7] Indeed, not only would this perhaps explain some of her later associations with that county,[8] but it is also highly unlikely that Alice would have been a member of the queen's bedchamber[9] if she had been of so obscure a family as that of a tiler.[10]

---

[5] Given-Wilson and Curteis, Royal Bastards, pp. 6-15.

[6]Thomas Walsingham, Chronicon Angliae, ab Anno Domini 1328 ad Annum 1388, ed. E. M. Thompson (Rolls Series 64: Kraus Reprint 1965), p. 95.

[7]As to her actual lineage, a continuing debate took place in the 'letters' pages of Notes and Queries and the Times Literary Supplement. Notes and Queries 7th Ser. VII 8 June 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 13 July 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 3 August 1889; 9th Ser. II 17 September 1896; Times Literary Supplement 3 July 1919; 7 August 1919; 21 August 1919; 28 August 1919; 4 Sept 1919.

[8]Not only did she have at least two manors - one of which she gave to her son in 1375 (see Chapter Four) - and many smaller pieces of property in this county (see Appendix Three), she also took the part of a relatively obscure individual named Thomas Fitzjohn in a land battle against the Abbot of Saint Albans. For a discussion of this dispute, see Chapter Four.

[9]Again, there is debate in Notes and Queries and the Times Literary Supplement over her actual status in the royal household. Notes and Queries 7th Ser. VII 8 June 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 13 July 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 3 August 1889; Times Literary Supplement 3 July 1919; 17 July 1919; 31 July 1919; 7 August 1919; 14 August 1919.

[10]Her date of birth is also open to conjecture. Though Alice's biographer, F. George Kay, places it at some time around 1348, this would seem unlikely considering that she is listed as being a member of the royal household in 1359. Considering that the age of

To overcome the restrictions placed on her as a result of her birth and gender and gain the amount of wealth and influence she did, Alice must have been an extraordinary individual. But, in terms of analyzing Alice's personal role in the events of the later years of Edward III's reign, it is important to realize that both ends of such a relationship were to a degree variable, dependent upon the generosity of the king and the character of the mistress. If we can define the king's end of this relationship and then contrast it to his mistress's role, we can then decide how much of the form that her career was to take was a result of the situation as dictated by factors external to Alice, and how much was a result of Alice's own doing.

Therefore, this thesis is not a biography, which has been attempted before, but primarily a profile of the financial results of her actions during the time that she was mistress of the king. This in turn will give not only a good case study as to how an individual, and especially a woman, accumulated wealth and power in the later medieval period, but it will help expose aspects of the dynamics of the court of Edward III.

ii) Source Material

The majority of the primary documentation contained in this thesis has been taken from the published documents of the Public Record Office in London. These include the Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous, Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Calendar of Fine Rolls, Calendar of Patent Rolls, and the Calendar of Close Rolls. Of these, the first two are

---

majority for a woman was usually fourteen, and as it is highly unlikely that she would have been taken into the king's service before this point, a birth date c. 1345 seems to be more reasonable. For Kay's date, see F. George Kay, Lady of the Sun: The Life and Times of Alice Perrers (London: Frederick Muller, 1966), p. 23; for the date of her first recorded association with the royal household, see Haldeen Braddy, "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers," Speculum 21 (1946):226.

probably the best sources for getting an idea of the extent of her land holdings. Not only does the Inquisitions Miscellaneous give an inventory of her moveable and nonmoveable possessions upon her final forfeiture in 1377, but given that many of the king's grants to her turned out to be wardships, the Inquisitions Post Mortem are also an invaluable source for gaining an estimate of the extent of these estates.

Similarly, the Fine Rolls, a listing of feudal rights held by the crown and lands forfeit to the crown, also give a detailed account of the extent of her holdings in 1377. It is, however, perhaps the Patent Rolls and the Close Rolls which give one the best idea as to how she actually obtained her wealth. These two sources indicate how the lands came into Alice's hands, the former being a record of grants from the crown, and the latter being the closed letters of royal administrational correspondence.

Thus, this type of source gives a fairly comprehensive account of the events of her financial career. There are, however, certain difficulties connected with these materials. First, they tend to be lacking in detail concerning her less formal transactions, many of which were important especially when it came to influence peddling. This, however, is to be expected in administrational records. More important is the fact that in the Inquisitions Miscellaneous and the Inquisitions Post Mortem, the best source for the monetary value of her lands, it was often in the interest of the inquisitors to undervalue properties so as not to be held responsible for any lost revenue.[11]

These obstacles, however, are not a great deterrent. Though the records of Alice's less formal deals are at times lacking, the documentation of royal patronage to her can be

[11] A more in-depth discussion of the contents of these sources may be found in G.R. Elton, England:1200-1640 (London: The Sources of History Limited, 1969), pp. 34-45.

believed to be virtually complete. As shall be seen, even the gift of the smallest amount of land was listed in the crown's records. As T.F. Tout pointed out in his Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, when the king made "his wife the present of a gown, an elaborate series of writs and indentures had to be drafted."[12] Thus, though we shall probably never be able to know the full character of her financial state,[13] the fact that we know virtually all that was given to her by the king will help us get at least a conservative estimate of her own accumulation of wealth.

iii) Historiography

Unfortunately, the reputation of Alice Perrers even unto the present day has been coloured by the chronicler's pen more than by the administrational records, and surviving contemporary opinion of her was almost unanimous in its condemnation. The three extant "historical" tracts of the period, The Rolls of Parliament, The Anonimalle Chronicle, and the Chronicon Angliae, all give a similar account of Alice's actions though they were ostensibly from independent perspectives.[14] The first, the Rolls of Parliament, was, in this period at least, simply an account of what was stated and what was passed in the parliaments of the period.[15] This source includes a list of petitions from both private individuals and the commons as a whole, the ordinances and statutes arising from such actions, and on occasion

---

[12]Thomas Frederick Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England: The Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals, 6 vols. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920-33), 4:414-415.

[13]Unfortunately cash gifts from the king to Alice are more difficult to trace and so leave us with only a conservative estimate of Alice's total worth. See Chapter Two.

[14]Though there may be some potential for dispute over this statement. See pages 12-13.

[15]A general discussion of what makes up the parliamentary records for this period can be found in Elton, England 1200-1640, pp. 84-85.

some of the debates surrounding these events.[16]

In some ways, then, this is good as a source because it gives us a record of what the governing class deemed important without any conscious attempt at historical analysis. But this source is also sadly lacking in one very important respect specific to the documentation of the period. For, though the Rolls of Parliament give a large quantity of information concerning the proceedings which took away Alice's land from her after the death of Edward III in 1377, they reveal to us very little about her part in the parliament which actually brought her abuses to the forefront, the Good Parliament of 1376. There is only one entry of note concerning her in the 1376 parliament, an ordinance forbidding her to meddle in the king's court.[17] There is no debate recorded around this fact, and therefore we have little to go on concerning the reasoning behind the ordinance.

Luckily, it is on this point that the "unofficial" sources of the period are very helpful. The only two contemporary sources which mention Alice in any detail, however, are the Anonimalle Chronicle and the writings of Thomas Walsingham. The first of these sources was written at St. Mary's, York, and fills in many of the gaps in the history of the period.[18] It is the only source, perhaps an eyewitness one at that,[19] for much of the deliberation of the Good Parliament, and therefore is invaluable as a source of motives for the session. It even gives verbatim the speeches of the speaker of the Commons, Peter de la

---

[16]For the limitations of the parliamentary rolls when dealing with the Good Parliament, see T.F.T. Plucknett, "The Impeachments of 1376," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, ser. 5, 1 (1951): 153-64.

[17]Rotuli Parliamentorum, ed. J. Strachey et al., 6 vols. (1767-77), 2:329.

[18]The Anonimalle Chronicle: 1333-1381 ed. V.H. Galbraith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970), pp. 79-107.

[19]John Taylor, English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 204.

Mare,[20] as well as the specific limitations put upon the king as a result of the parliament.[21]

If, however, one wants a broader description of Alice's life outside of the time of the parliament, one has to look at the works of another monk, Thomas Walsingham of the monastery at St Albans.[22] He gives us a lively account of Alice's rise to power, her manipulation of the king, her control of the courts, and various other crimes. Moreover, it is his description of the last moments of Edward III's life which has left the most indelible mark on the reputation of Alice, for it includes the infamous episode where she removed the rings from the dying king's fingers.[23]

But again there are problems inherent in these sources. One is simply the fact that both

---

[20]The Anonimalle Chronicle, pp. 81-88.

[21]The Anonimalle Chronicle, p. 92. A helpful translation of the Anonimalle Chronicle's description of the Good Parliament may be found in Appendix III of Taylor's English Historical Literature, pp. 301-313.

[22] For a discussion of Walsingham and the St. Alban's chronicle tradition, see Taylor, English Historical Literature, pp. 59-77; Antonia Grandsen, Historical Writing in England, vol. 2: C.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), pp. 118-156.

[23]"Quid tuncalicia Perres fecerit, quidve egerit, de facili conjicer poteris, quisquis mores meretrices agnoveris; licet nemo sit, qui velit describere facta sua. Nam mox, ut praesensit regem pedem in mortis januis posuisse, fugam meditata est; sed ante recessum suum, ut cunctis manifeste monstratet se regem, non propter se, sed propter sua dilexisse, anulos, quos pro dignitate regia gestabat in digitis, de regiis manibus furtive subtraxit, ne cuiquam veniret in dubium verum fore vetus proverbium, quia nulla meretrix scrupilo caret furti. Tali modo regi valefaciens, talesque sibi pro beneficiis grates rependens, se subtraxit."(Chronicon Angliae, pp. 142-143).

According to Grandsen, this is actually a combination of two of Walsingham's chronicles. For a discussion of the confusion over the manuscripts see V.H. Galbraith, "Thomas Walsingham and the St. Alban's Chronicle," English Historical Review 47 (1932):15-19; Gransden, Historical Writing in England, p. 125, n. 59.

chronicles are from religious houses[24] and one must wonder not only how unbiased ecclesiastical opinion was towards Alice, but also from what sources these writers were working. For, though they are accepted to be original texts for the events of 1376-77,[25] if they were eyewitness accounts one must still wonder how exact the memories of the chroniclers were, considering the fact that both chroniclers are believed to have been composing their works some time after the fact.[26] Likewise, if they were based on other individuals' accounts, it must be wondered what the biases of these individuals were. Moreover, and this is in respect to Walsingham in particular, the abbey of St Albans was known to have had quite a heated dispute with Alice over some land in Hertfordshire.[27] As the Abbey originally lost this case, it could not have done much for Walsingham's impartiality.

Most of the subsequent chronicles and histories up until the present century at best mirror the charges in the Rolls of Parliament or the Anonimalle Chronicle, and at worst repeat the more sensational accusations put forth by Walsingham. Near contemporary works such as the continuation of the Polychronicon[28] and later efforts such as Capgrave's Chronicle of

---

[24]There is some question, however, as to whether the chronicler who composed the description of the Good Parliament in the Anonimalle Chronicle was actually a secular clerk. See Gransden, Historical Writing 2:111; Taylor, English Historical Literature, pp. 142-143.

[25]See George Holmes, The Good Parliament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 1; Taylor, English Historical Literature, pp. 198-205.

[26]Gransden disputes Galbraith's estimate of a two to three year time lapse between the events and their recording. She believes that it can sometimes be pushed to three to four years. See Gransden, Historical Writing, 2:124 footnote 55.The 1369-81 section of the Anonimalle Chronicle was probably compiled in the late 1380's. See Taylor, English Historical Literature, p. 143.

[27]See Chapter Four.

[28]Ranulph Higden, Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis, ed. Joseph Lumby (Rolls series 41:8), pp. 385, 426.

England[29] all essentially present the same view of Alice, often even in the same words.[30] Only in the late seventeenth century was there a shift from the tradition of Alice as a greedy, wicked courtesan. This is given to us by Joshua Barnes, writing in the 1680's.[31] He defends her from charges that she had been of low birth, that she was the king's concubine, and that, perhaps, Walsingham's most famous accusation against her, that she stole the rings off the dying king's fingers:

> But as for Dame Alice Perrers her rifling him of his rings from his fingers, it is in no way credible, not only from what we have said of her before; and that upon her Convention in Parliament in the year following, there was no such thing laid to her charge by her most inveterate enemies; but also because if she did it before witnesses, it must have come out, and then could not but have been fatal to her, and if not it could not have been known.[32]

However, it was Walsingham's visual imagery that stuck in the minds of historians. Even in this century Trevelyan could still state with conviction that "she was in the habit of attending the law courts to support her friends and overawe the judges like any other great noble, and she possessed herself of money and lands by fair means and foul."[33] Although Trevelyan also notes that much of Alice's reputation can be connected with her notoriety by

---

[29]Probably written towards the end of Capgrave's life(1393-1464). John Capgrave, Chronicle of England, ed. Francis Hungerston (Rolls Series 1, 1858), pp. xxi(Preface), 231.

[30]For example, compare Capgrave's discussion of Alice's actions with one of Walsingham's (found in Chapter Two, page 47 footnote 120):

"The Commuante asked eke, that Dame Alis Pereres schuld be remeved oute of the Kyngis hous, as a woman malepert, and entermenting in every mater. This woman would sumtyme sitte be the Juges on the bench, and sumtyme be the Doctouris in the Consistory, and plete with the treuth, and ageyn the treuth, be the Kyngis auctorite; whech turned gretly onto his vileny and slaunder." Capgrave, Chronicle of England, p. 231.

[31]It is interesting that this historian happens to take this stance a few years after Charles II was also seriously involved with a mistress. Joshua Barnes, The History of That Most Victorious Monarch Edward III . . . (Cambridge: John Hayes, 1688), pp. 872-873, 908-909.

[32]Barnes, Edward III, p. 908-909.

[33]G.M. Trevelyan, England in the Age of Wycliffe, (London:Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912), p. 29.

the pen of Walsingham,[34] he still follows Walsingham's general framework concerning her life.

Indeed, it has only been within the last thirty years that anyone has taken a new look at Alice Perrers. One work, a biography by George Kay,[35] is a popular and somewhat speculative account which makes only limited use of documentary evidence outside the chronicle sources. Nonetheless, Kay does provide some interesting insights and portrays Alice in a somewhat more sympathetic light as being, if not a saint, then at least an intelligent woman making the best of her circumstances.

The most forthright effort to revise her image has come in Michael Packe's King Edward III, who says of Alice Perrers:

> Yet it is just as likely that she prolonged rather than shortened his life as his general health faded in the 1370's, perhaps by then less of a mistress and more of a favourite nurse and enlivening companion. Edward had fallen for her when his faculties were sound, and it is unlikely she was the harridan that she was made out to be.[36]

He even states that she was perhaps less expensive than Queen Philippa, at least in terms of liquid funds.[37]

But, Kay's work aside, all of the historiography of Alice Perrers is in essence a

---

[34]Trevelyan, England in the Age of Wycliffe, p. 29.

[35]F. George Kay, Lady of the Sun: The Life and Times of Alice Perrers (London: Frederick Muller, 1966).

[36]Michael Packe, King Edward III, ed. L.C.B. Seaman.(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 287.

[37]Packe, King Edward III, p. 287.

historiography of Edward III.[38] Articles detailing her connections with the poet Chaucer[39], her husband's family,[40] and the fate of her son John[41] as well as a debate in the Times Literary Supplement[42] and Notes and Queries[43] early in this century concerning her background and her ownership of certain manors, useful as they are, have tended to reinforce the treatment of Alice Perrers as a footnote to history. Thus it is perhaps understandable if regrettable that broader treatments of the period have continued to rehash the same traditions concerning this remarkable woman.

iv) Organization

In order to gain an understanding of Alice's financial and political actions, it is important to assess the degree of independent action in her career. Thus we must try to separate what she acquired from the king as a result of his generosity and what came to her of her own accord. The division between these two forms of acquisition, however, must be defined. Gifts from the king are designated as anything which he is recorded as having given of his own accord. Conversely, if Alice alone is noted as being a party in the transaction, we must attribute it to her own initiative. Of course, there will be transactions which fall in between

---

[38] Aside from the general books on the historiography of the period cited above, there is also a very helpful article on the historiography of the reign of Edward III by May McKisack. May McKisack, "Edward III and the Historians," History 45 (1960):1-15.

[39]Haldeen Braddy, "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers," Speculum 21 (1946):222-228; Haldeen Braddy, "Chaucer, Dame Alice Perrers, and Cecily Chaumpaigne," Speculum 52 (1977):906-911.

[40]T.R. Gambier-Parry, "Alice Perrers and her Husband's Relatives," English Historical Review 47:186 (April 1932):272-276.

[41]Margaret Galway, "Alice Perrers's Son John," English Historical Review 66 (1951):242-246.

[42]Times Literary Supplement 3 July 1919; 17 July 1919; 31 July 1919; 7 August 1919; 14 August 1919; 21 August 1919; 28 August 1919; 4 Sept 1919.

[43]Notes and Queries 7th Ser. VII 8 June 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 13 July 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 3 August 1889; 9th Ser. II 17 September 1896.

these two categories. When this occurs, these special cases will be separately treated and placed in the framework of the thesis accordingly.[44]

For ease in organization, the following structure will be used. The next three chapters will discuss in turn the king's patronage to Alice, Alice's gains of her own account, and Alice's patronage to others. Each chapter will be subdivided into three sections: transactions concerning land, loans, and influence. The land sections will be further divided into three time periods:[45] i) 1362-1369: the time from when she first comes onto the scene as a definite financial entity to the death of Queen Philippa, ii) 1370-1373: from the death of Philippa to the end of the year of the most lucrative period of Alice's career, and iii) from this point to her final forfeiture in December of 1377. When this is complete, the final chapter will provide a statistical summary. In this way it is hoped that we may help to delineate not only how much Alice's own initiative and acumen had in her career, but exactly also what it took for a woman to rise above her designated role and become consequential in the politics of later medieval England.

---

[44]The mitigating circumstances that make a case marginal will usually be placed in a footnote.

[45]Except in Chapter Four, where the limited amount of land patronage by Alice makes such divisions unnecessary.

CHAPTER TWO

Royal Patronage to Alice Perrers

Patronage was one of the key attributes of the royal prerogative. Indeed, considering that, in theory at least, the whole social order was dependent upon the continued existence of royal good will, this could not be otherwise. Moreover, a monarch needed patronage to reward good service, cement alliances, and aid friends, and it was rare that anyone questioned this policy.[46]

By the latter part of his reign, however, Edward III had become so dependent upon parliamentary power in order to finance his exploits abroad that patronage was becoming potentially vulnerable to partisan politics of the period. It was only when the war had been turning a profit in terms of ransoms that the objects of patronage went unnoticed. Thus, up until the renewal of the war in 1369, although Edward had to face some resentment at his domestic spending policies,[47] the fact was that his household was still financing itself.[48] Indeed, Edward himself gave large sums from his household funds for the preparations for the renewal of the war effort.[49]

---

[46]"Yet it was always recognized that the distribution of grants, annuities and offices were both the right and the duty of any king." Chris Given-Wilson, The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance 1360-1413 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), p. 131.

[47]There was a certain amount of censure of Edward previous to this point as the 1368 parliamentary charges of extravagance against the royal steward, Sir John Lee, was to show. See Tout, Chapters, 4:161-62; Maude Clarke, "The Origin of Impeachment," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, ser. 4, 24(1942):53-54.

[48]Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 138.

[49]Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 138.

Ironically, by this action, Edward put himself in a situation of financial distress.[50] Hence, to be able to reward his favourites, Edward now became increasingly dependent upon the exchequer and therefore parliamentary funding. Part of the attack on and dismissal of William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, in 1371 may be seen as an indictment of Edward's patronage policy.[51] For, although it is often suggested that this was an attack on the clerical preponderance in the royal administration,[52] the fact that this man's career was so publicly a creation of Edward's patronage made any criticism of this minister a criticism of royal policy.

I Lands and Other Material Grants

If the king was to have problems justifying his continued preferential treatment of Wykeham, by the same logic his patronage of someone like Alice Perrers, who was essentially useless to the government of the realm, would be considered even less tenable. And, to say that royal mistresses previous to this point gained little in terms of land from their royal lovers may be considered an understatement. Unlike their later counterparts, according to Given-Wilson only three medieval royal mistresses gained even small gifts of land.[53] None gained any permanent status in the form of a title, as male favorites

---

[50]Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 139.

[51]For a discussion of Wykeham's rise to power, see T.F. Tout, Chapters, 3:235-239.

[52]Though Tout states that the anti-clerical aspect of his removal has been somewhat over stressed. See Tout, Chapters, 3:266-72.

[53]Rosamund Clifford(Henry II), Elizabeth Shore(Edward IV), and of course Alice Perrers - as Given-Wilson and Curteis note. However, aside from Alice Perrers, the amount of patronage involved was nothing compared to the royal mistresses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in both France and England. Given-Wilson and Curteis, The Royal Bastards, pp. 11-14.

commonly did,[54] and often they were married off when the monarch had done with them. Sometimes, however, they were treated even less kindly, receiving no such compensation and even being relegated to the status of court concubine. Thus, by publicly giving up not only their honour but also their status (many of these women were, after all, already married)[55] they were far more open to royal whim concerning their tenure as mistresses as well as their eventual fate.

i) 1362-1369

Fortunately for Alice, the king was well disposed to her from the beginning. Nonetheless, at first Edward did not go far beyond the accepted limits of patronage to a female in the royal service. The first recorded royal gift to Alice Perrers was on 20 October 1366 in the form of a life grant of two tuns of Gascon wine "for long service to Queen Philippa."[56] But it is debatable whether the gift was at the instigation of the queen or whether the impetus came from Edward himself since their households were amalgamated in 1360.[57] Whatever the case, wine grants were the common form of appreciation from the Queen to her servants, one lady in waiting, Alice de Bedingfeld, received a tun of wine a year for life as well as an annuity of 20 pounds,[58] while another, Joan de Carrue, received

---

[54]Perhaps the most famous instance of this was Edward II awarding Piers de Gaveston with the Earldom of Cornwall, although Edward III's creation of a number of earls and dukes in 1337 out of those men who had been loyal to him in the troubled times of his early rule is definitely comparable. See Chris Given-Wilson, The English Nobility, pp. 29-45.

[55]Given-Wilson, Royal Bastards, p. 14.

[56]CPR 1364-67, p. 321.

[57]Chris Given-Wilson, "The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households, 1360-9," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 51:123 (May 1978):183-187.

[58]B.C. Hardy, Philippa of Hainault and her Times (London: John Long Ltd., 1910), p. 141.

six tuns per annum of wine landed at the port of Bristol.[59] Moreover, strictly monetary forms of rewards were also popular for service in the royal household. Joan de Sancto Hillaro, Joan de Wikhay, Joan de Bredon, Mary Chasteller, Elizabeth Chaundos, Stephanetta de Olneye, and Alicia de Preston, all damsels of Queen Philippa, were to receive annuities ranging from 5 to 40 pounds during the life of Queen Philippa.[60] Therefore, neither this gift nor one six months later for a length of cloth[61] can be considered irregular for a person in Alice's position.

But gifts of land were a different matter. Perhaps as a result of the potential for various forms of abuse of land grants, property was rarely granted as a reward for lesser royal servants. In the period of Alice's career, only one of Philippa's damsels, Stephanetta de Olneye, received land from the royal couple. This grant was of a wardship of the lands in Lincolnshire of the estate of the late Robert Tiffoure, "chivalier." Moreover, the grant of this wardship was in exchange for a similarly valued annuity.[62] Finally, on a more general point, the gift of a wardship in itself, though monetarily quite profitable, was only temporary - that is, lasting until the minor came of age.

Indeed, since it would cause him little in terms of permanent capital loss, it is not surprising that the king's first gift of land to his mistress was in the form of a wardship granted on 14 May 1367. At that time, Alice Perrers was granted all the lands late of Robert

---

[59]Hardy, Philippa of Hainault, p. 141.

[60]Sancto Hillaro: CPR 1354-1358, p. 365; CPR 1367-1370, p. 14; de Wikhay: CPR 1354-1358, p. 608; de Bredon: CPR 1358-1361, p. 230; Chasteller: CPR 1361-1364, p. 411; Chaundos: CPR 1364-1367, p. 115; de Olneye: CPR 1367-1370, p. 107; de Preston: CPR 1367-1370, p. 277.

[61]Tout, Chapters, 4:415.

[62]CPR 1370-74, p. 262.

de Tilliol, "chivalier," with marriage rights for the heir as well as all the lands which he held in Scotland.[63] But despite its limited term (the heir was already 11 at the time of the grant), this was no small gift. It included the manors of Houghton, Kirklinton, Solport, Rickerby, and the castle of Scaleby,[64] in actuality a minor power block on the northern border of England and thus a profitable form of rental income.

The next royal grant, however, began to accentuate the difference in treatment between Alice and the other members of the royal household. On 30 July 1368, the king granted her two-thirds of the manor of Monylaws, Northumberland with the reversion of the third part.[65] However, instead of being given a wardship, Alice was granted the land in full right - that is, to herself "and her heirs."[66] On the other hand, it is notable that this was a manor which escheated to the king and therefore caused him little inconvenience to grant.

Five months later, in November of 1368, the characteristics of the Monylaws transaction are repeated. This time it was "lawn [pasture] of Morton with the covert [woodland] of Mortonscogh in the forest of Inglewode" in Cumbria which was involved.[67] The land, part of the estate of Robert de Tilliol, was given to her in full right.

However, while these gifts were not of a magnitude to cause any problems from critics, it is notable that Alice Perrers was given no annuity on the death of Queen Philippa as the

---

[63]CPR 1364-67, p. 396, 397, 418.

[64]CIPM Vol. XII Edward III, pp. 148-150.

[65]CPR 1367-70, pp. 146, 292.

[66]CPR 1367-70, p. 146.

[67]CFR 1356-68, p. 349; CPR 1367-70, p. 183.

other members of the household had been.[68] Rather, she only received the obligatory black cloth for the mourning period after Philippa's death.[69] It is therefore probably safe to assume that between the date of her only grant to Alice in October 1366[70] and her death three years later Philippa found it either distasteful or unnecessary to reward Alice for her service.[71] Edward, then, may be seen as sole dispenser of royal patronage to Alice Perrers.

---

[68]CPR 1370-1374, p. 342. This statement is contrary to the belief of the modern biographers of Perrers, Queen Philippa, and Geoffrey Chaucer. These writers - namely, George Kay, B.C. Hardy, and Donald Howard - base their statements upon an entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls for 20 January 1370 which lists one "Alice de Preston" as a damsel of Queen Philippa and, along with the other royal damsels, as receiving a 10 mark annuity as a reward for good service. George Kay states that "it is always accepted that the bequest referred to Perrers, for no de Preston is recorded among the ladies of the Queen's retinue" (Kay, Lady of the Sun, p. 69). The other biographers have a similar confidence about the connection between the two names. See Hardy, Philippa of Hainault, P. 302; D.R. Howard, Chaucer, p. 127.

However, if one looks back in the Patent Rolls to June 1369(CPR 1367-1370, p. 277), or forward into the 1370's(CPR 1367-1370, p. 360; CPR 1377-1381, p. 125), one begins to realize that this Alice de Preston is listed as getting grants at the same time as Alice is at the height of her power.In the official records, Alicia de Preston received two grants from the king - the previously mentioned 10 mark annuity and a grant in February, 1378 of a fourth of a manor called Oore in Kent and the reversion of a nearby mill (CPR 1367-1370, p. 342; CPR 1377-1381, p. 125). Moreover, the lands which de Preston does get are not among those listed as being owned by Alice either in the forfeiture proceedings of 1377 or in her husband's, William de Windsor, attempt to retrieve all her lands in 1380. Furthermore, the land which was given to de Preston was given at a time when Alice Perrers was being made to give up her lands for a second time. Finally and perhaps most damaging to the theory of any link between the two names was the fact that Alicia de Preston was listed in 1378 as being "late the wife of Peter de Preston"(CPR 1377-1381, p. 125) at a time when Alice is known as a result of the investigations of the Good Parliament of 1376 to have been married to de Windsor.

[69]Life Records of Chaucer (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1900), pp. 172-175.

[70]If indeed it was of Philippa's initiative. See pages 25-26.

[71]In 1364-1365 - or 1366-1367, depending upon the historian - Alice had a son, John de Southeray, who is generally believed to be Edward's bastard. Such being the case, and knowledge of such events being usually wide spread, it was indeed perhaps not by oversight that Alice was left out of any posthumous reward by the Queen. For a discussion using the earlier date, see Given-Wilson and Curteis, Royal Bastards, pp. 138-144; for the later date see Margaret Galway, "Alice Perrers' son John," pp. 242-244.

ii) 1370-1373

Thus, by the end of the first phase in her career, Alice Perrers was getting far more than would have befitted her station. And yet, the king was not in any way "under the spell" of this woman. He retained a policy throughout of giving her only noncontroversial pieces of property, mainly wardships and small pieces of land. After the death of Philippa on 15 August 1369 it might have been expected that Edward's generosity towards his mistress would have increased.[72] Such, however, was not the case.

Indeed, Alice received only three royal land grants in this period. The first came on 20 February 1370. At this time, the king granted her the wardship of all the lands of the wife of Robert de Tilliol.[73] This was hardly a new grant at all, but rather land from the estate of Robert de Tilliol which passed to his wife as dower upon his death in 1367, and which in turn passed to Alice as the holder of the wardship of the husband's lands.

The next grant of land made by Edward to Alice was a more controversial one and was made almost three years later on 14 January 1373. The grant in question was to Alice Perrers and her heirs of a "messuage and a shop in the parish of All Hallows the Less in the ward of Dowgate, London."[74] But it was not simply that this was well positioned, being in an area of London which was close to the vintners' and the fishmongers' halls and therefore close to much of the business of the City merchants. It was more the history of the property which matters here. Edward had originally made his longtime friend and creditor, Thomas

---

[72] After all, even a medieval monarch would have had to have treated such a situation with a certain amount of decorum if he had any sense of love or devotion to his wife. Edward supposedly had this devotion. See Michael Prestwich, The Three Edwards: War and State in England 1272-1377 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), pp. 241-242.

[73] CPR 1367-70, p. 376. Also see pages 27-28.

[74] CPR 1370-74, p. 229.

de Swanland,[75] give up the property for debts owed.[76] He then gave it, on 5 August 1372 to one Guy de Allesle of Stratford le Bow and his wife in full right.[77] It is notable, however, it was being occupied at the time by John de Southam(Southeray), Edward's bastard by Alice.[78] Obviously Edward gave Alice the property in order to look after his son while he was still under age.

Thus the royal patronage rate to Alice Perrers was minimal in the first part of the 1370's. However, in terms of moveable goods at this time, the king's mistress seems to have fared somewhat better. A large portion of these gifts was made to her in the form of jewelry. However, there may be more to these gifts than a mere taste for luxury.[79] D.R. Howard,

---

[75]". . . by the middle of the fourteenth century, many English merchants, like Thomas Swanland, Walter Cheriton,or John Poultney had accumulated capital to such an extent that Edward III increasingly relied on them to finance his war in France." A.R. Myers, London in the Age of Chaucer (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972), p. 91.

[76]CPR 1370-74, p. 191.

[77]CPR 1370-74, p. 191.

[78]"She bore the king a son who was acknowledged as 'John Southerey' and, with respect equal to that accorded to his mother, was given clothes with the young noblemen in the king's wardship as a squire of the chamber." Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 68.

[79] Evidence of this taste may be seen in the inventory of her dwellings in the parish of All Hallows the Less in London taken at the time of her final forfeiture in late 1377:

> "6 carpets of white tapestry worth forty shillings; a celure and tester made in one piece with white satin striped with gold, having cords, price 51. 6s. 8d.; (3 curtains of white taffeta worth 26s 8d; a featherbed with a bolster worth 40s; . . ."(CIM 1377-88, p. 13).

The list continues like this for five pages, and this is all only in her London houses. Far more, as we shall see, to a certain degree, was spread throughout her other holdings. See CIM 1377-88, pp. 13-17.

Further evidence of this taste for the luxury is also seen in one of the primary social critics of the time, William Langland. In his work Piers the Ploughman, Langland might very well have had Alice Perrers in mind when he described the allegorical character of Lady Meed

> "I loked upon thy left half . . . ,
> and was war of a womman wonderliche yclothed - Purfiled with pelure, the pureste

Chaucer's latest biographer, puts forth the theory that Edward gave Alice gifts of jewels bought by him from London merchants.[80] Alice would then present the same jewels to him again, supposedly after a suitably long period of time, saying that "they were on loan from the merchants against a decision to purchase - and Edward, his memory failing, would buy them for a second time."[81]

Given the nature of the situation, it is difficult to say if this was actually the case but there were definitely grants of some kind being made to Alice, ostensibly in the form of sales of jewels to the king. As is noted in the records of the exchequer, Alice was given 200 pounds in exchange for jewels against "the feast of the Nativity of our Lord last past."[82] More important, however, and more controversial, concerning the king's gifts to her in form of jewels, is the gift to his mistress of "all jewels and other goods of the king and queen, received by her to the king's use from Eufemia late the wife of Walter de Heselarton, knight."[83] This again, however, was clothed in some form of legality, or at least propriety,

---

on erthe,
Ycorouned with a coroune, the Kyng hath noon bettre.
Fetisliche hire fyngres were fretted with gold wyr,
And thereon red rubies as rede as any gleede,
And diamaundes of derrest pris and double manere saphires,
Orientals and ewages envenymes to destroye.
Hire robe was ful riche, of reed scarlet engreyned,
With ribanes of reed gold and of riche stones.
(William Langland, The Vision of Piers Plowman, ed. A.V.C. Schmidt [London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1978], p. 17).

[80]Howard, Chaucer, p. 204.

[81]Howard, Chaucer, p. 204.

[82]From an entry in the Issue Roll dated 15 April 1372. Cited in Bernard Huppe, "The A-Text of Piers Plowman and the Norman Wars," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 54 (March 1939): 49-50.

[83]CPR 1370-74, p. 347. However, as "Hermentrude" points out in Notes and Queries, these were most likely not all of Philippa's jewels but simply those which had been put in Euphemia Heselarton's keeping. See Notes and Queries ser. 7:7 (8 June 1889):450-51.

which had accompanied most of the king's other grants to Alice. For, three weeks before this grant to Alice Perrers, on July 18, 1373, a release was made:

> to Eufemia, late the wife of Walter de Heselarton, knight, of all actions and demands which the king or his heirs has or could have against her touching all jewels and goods of the king or of his late consort Philippa delivered to the said Walter in his lifetime by Alice Perrers, late one of the damsels of the chamber of the said queen; because Alice Perers has received the same from her by order of the king to her use.[84]

It would seem, then, that Alice, as an "officer" in the retinue of the queen, had received a portion of Philippa's jewels into her keeping.[85] By having Alice deliver them to Heselarton and then granting them back to her, the king may have hoped to dilute the effect of giving away the much beloved queen's personal effects to his mistress.[86]

iii) 1374-1377

In the last years of his reign, however, Edward's material patronage moved back to an emphasis on land grants. Her first grant in this period came at some point after 12 February 1374[87] and was in the form of the keeping of the wardship of the lands late of Fulk Fitz Waryn, knight: This knight's estates included the manors of Bentham,[88] Crofton,[89] Stanton,[90] Wantage[91] as well as the castle of Whittington.[92] Unlike the previous

---

[84]CPR 1370-74, p. 331.

[85] It may be conjectured that these were some of the same jewels which she sold to Edward in 1372 since no other major material gifts were noted as having been given to her.

[86]There is also some evidence that Alice was selling jewels to William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester. See CCR 1385-89, pp. 645-47.

[87]Calculated by the date of death of Fitz Waryn.

[88]CFR 1377-83, pp. 85, 327.

[89]CCR 1377-81, p. 503.

[90]CFR 1377-83, p. 69.

[91]CFR 1377-83, p. 69.

wardships that she had been given by the king, some of these were in an area which she herself seems to have been developing a preference.[93] While Whittington and Stanton were in Shropshire and Crofton in Yorkshire and therefore of little worth to her except as income-producing manors, Wantage was in Berkshire and Bentham was in Wiltshire - well positioned properties both in terms of their proximity to London as well as to the king.[94]

In August of 1375, she was granted another wardship, this time of the lands lately of John Payn of London, 'armurer'.[95] Unfortunately for Alice, this was not nearly as lucrative as the Fitz Waryn estates and was composed of only one manor, Frome Valeys.[96] A footnote to this grant, however, may shed some light upon how Alice treated these minorities since there was a specific rider put on the grant which had been placed on no previous gift to Alice, namely that she was given the minority provided that she "finds fitting sustenance for the said heir and do the real service and other charges incumbent on the lands."[97] That this now had to be stated indicates that Alice was not only treating the wardships as a strictly

---

[92]CFR 1377-83, p. 85, 110; CIM 1377-88, p. 23.

[93]See Appendix One.

[94]There might, however, be some controversy as to whether this was actually a gift from the king to Alice. For, though we must accept the statement that these lands were of the king's grant as stated in the forfeiture proceedings(CFR 1377-83, p. 85, 88, 110), it is interesting that the wardship was originally given to William Latimer, royal chamberlain, and Richard Stury, knight of the king's chamber, on 10 May 1374 (CPR 1370-74, p. 436). That the king would then rescind this grant so quickly and then give it to Alice is suspicious in itself. Add this to the fact that there is no record of Alice having received the lands in the first instance, and one might hypothesize that her acquisition of these lands may well have been the result of a private deal between herself, Latimer and Stury and that the later citation that it was of the king's gift may well simply have been based on the fact that she did have control of the wardship at the time of forfeiture.

[95]CPR 1374-77, p. 134.

[96]Frome Valeys(Somerset) - Manor(CIPM 1374-77, p. 330; CIM 1377-88, p. 44). This is also mentioned as two manors - Frome and Valeys(CPR 1377-81, p. 167, 310) - though it seems that they had at some point been merged into one parcel.

[97]CPR 1374-77, p. 134.

commercial venture, but also that she might have done this to the detriment of the lands involved - a practice known as "wastage" at the time.

The only gift of land which Edward gave Alice in full right in the last three years of his life was the manor of Bramfordspeke in Devon in December of 1375.[98] But, as with all his previous grants to his mistress, this grant was made under mitigating circumstances:

> December 20, 1375 (Westminster) Grant to Alice Perrers and her heirs of the manor of Braunford Speek and all other lands in the county of Devon, and the advowson of the church of Wemmeworth in the same county, late of Robert son of William Speek, chaplain, which are in the king's hand because Robert in his lifetime committed a felony for which he abjured the realm, as is found by inquisition, to hold for as long as the premises shall be in the king's hand for that cause.[99]

Bramfordspeke was the last full grant of land made to Alice Perrers by the king before his death in June of 1377. She was, however, granted one final wardship on 4 February 1376 of "all lands which Walter de Hamby held on the day of his death by knight service of the heir of Margaret de Orreby."[100] The heir of Margaret de Orby was still a minor at the time, so Alice was given power over her minority as well as the right to her marriage.[101]

Alice was again warned in this transaction against wasting the wardship, which reinforces the suggestion that she was getting something of a reputation for abusing

---

[98]CPR 1374-77, p. 205.

[99]CPR 1374-77, p. 205.

[100]CPR 1374-77, p. 236.

[101]But, while on the record Alice took no active part in the transaction, it would be well to point out that this was the completion of the wardship of the de Orby estate which Alice herself had arranged in 1370. It would seem likely that this is one of the cases in which Alice 'whispered in the king's ear' in order to get what she wanted. for a discussion of the original de Orby transaction, see Chapter Three.

minorities.[102] In fact, after the de Hamby grant, the only other major grant which the king gave Alice was the arrears from a grant of wine which she was originally granted in 1366.[103] The worsening of the political climate plus perhaps a growing reputation for abuse of the king's patronage seems to have sharply reduced her acquisitions.

II Loans and Other Monetary Gifts

In terms of money given or loaned by the king to Alice, it is more difficult to trace the form and extent of patronage. That she was definitely lent or given sums of money is evident simply in the fact that she was able to lend sums of money far beyond the means of a member of the royal household early on in her career.[104] Moreover, the income from her accrued properties in the period up until 1369 was unlikely to have been sufficiently large to cover any extensive credit activities.[105] Thus, it is almost certain that Edward was giving her some money. Unfortunately, there are no records of these payments in the existing documents of the royal household or the exchequer. This may have been a result of the fact that the money was coming directly out of Edward's personal allowance - namely, the chamber funds.[106]

But we must be careful not to exaggerate the amount of the covert cash gifts that the king may have been giving her. It is unlikely that he gave any large sums of money to her

---

[102]The ruinous condition of many of her wardships at the time of forfeiture seem to reinforce this point. For example, see the state of the manors of Wantyng(CIM 1377-88, p. 4) and Whittington(CIM 1377-88, p. 23)of the estate of Fulk Fitz Waryn as well as the state of the de Orby wardship(CIM 1377-88, p. 10).

[103]CPR 1364-67, p. 321;CCR 1374-77, p. 485.

[104]See Chapter Four

[105]See Appendix Two

[106]"The money which the king kept in his chamber was his pocket-money." Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 85.

because the available income of the chamber was obviously limited. Therefore, any such amounts had to come out of the finances of the exchequer and so end up in that department's more detailed records, as did the money given to her for the sake of de Windsor.[107]

It must, then, remain an open question as to where Alice got this money so early in her career. There is the possibility that she was getting credit from others, though there is no evidence for this; there is a chance that she had money from her parents, especially if she was of the Hertfordshire Perrers; or there is even the possibility that she saved any small sums that the king might have given to her out of his own pocket. Whatever the case, for a good part of the 1370's, limited financial patronage continued to be the policy of the king. Indeed, it was only towards the end of her career that we have proof that she was getting anything in the way of liquid wealth from the king. The only purely monetary gift to her throughout her career came in February of 1376 when 120 pounds was paid to her out of the Chamber's income.[108] Some extra money may have also arisen out of the right to marry off the minors of some of the wardships she controlled, which involved a onetime payment of a fine to the person who owned the rights. Alice had three rights to marriages in 1375-76, but the amount involved is unfortunately not known.[109]

---

[107]To be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Issues of the Exchequer, ed. Frederick Devon (London: John Murray, 1837, p. 197.

[108]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 69.

[109] The first wardship was in August of 1375 and was connected with the Payn wardship (CPR 1374-77, p. 236). The second marriage was granted on November 8, 1375 in which she received the right to "the marriage of Richard brother and heir of Thomas de Ponynges."(CPR 1374-77, p. 187). The final marriage grant in this period was in February of 1376 and was connected with another wardship of hers - the one of the de Hamby estate.(CPR 1374-77, p. 236).

III Influence

Considering Alice's newly arisen status of royal mistress, royal influence was a seemingly prominent form of royal patronage to Alice in the period 1364-69, although the only certain evidence of this comes from a court order dated 9 December 1364. Here Richard Lyons, at this time successful London vintner and lord of the manor of Overhall-in-Liston, was ordered to "keep the peace with Alice de Perrers, and not to interfere with her going where she wished on the king's business and on her own."[110] Sadly, the exact reason behind this curious injunction has not survived,[111] but it is clear that, even at this stage, Alice was dealing with the highest levels of London's mercantile community, which seems extraordinary considering her station and sex.

Examples of this kind of influence remain shadowy, but do surface on occasion.[112] More obvious was the display of the king's favour in the Smithfield Tournament of 1375. Alice Perrers was made the Queen of the tournament and she took the specific title of "Lady of the Sun". As well, in the same year, the king commissioned the building of a barge which he christened La Alice[113]. Alice Perrers was, then, at least outwardly, receiving some

---

[110]Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London:a.d. 1364-1381 ed. A.H. Thomas (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1929), p. 11.

[111]George Holmes also discusses this entry and gives some account of the background of Lyons. See Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 79. For a more complete discussion of Lyons' career, see A.R. Myers, "The Wealth of Richard Lyons," in Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson,eds. T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), pp. 301-07.

[112] There is only one piece of evidence in this period that royal influence was at work for Alice. According to Haldeen Braddy in his article "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers", Alice Perrers was granted a part in the "controlling of customs and subsidies." This is a very interesting statement and, if true, would link Alice even closer to the mercantile community than before thought. Unfortunately the author of this article has left this claim unsubstantiated by his sources. See Braddy, "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers," p. 227.

[113]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 68.

royal backing on the public stage. Similarly, she may be seen, at least on the surface, to be considered of as much importance at this time as the King's daughter Isabella, Countess of Bedford, for in 1375 she is "coupled" with her in a grant of clothing, presumably in preparation for the Smithfield tournament which was to take place in June.[114]

But it would not do to exaggerate the king's influence. In the middle 1370's there was beginning to be some sense that his actual public backing of her was not as well founded as he had made out. In 1374, there is a court case between Alice and the Abbot of St. Albans over the manor of Oxeye.[115] Although the Abbot lost, it is perhaps indicative of her lack of public support from the king that the Abbot was willing to take on the royal mistress in the first place.[116]

Perhaps more indicative of this lack of public support for Alice by the king comes in June of 1375. Take, for example, the following entry in the Patent Rolls:

> June 1, 1375(Westminster) - Commission to Simon de Leek, Richard de Byngham, Robert Martell, Bertram de Saunby and Ellis de Thoresby to make inquisition in the county of Nottingham touching certain evildoers who broke the manor of Alice de Perers at Fynygley, took away 8 oxen, 5 cows and eleven calves, worth 20 marks, cut the legs of six oxen, chased many other cattle into her crops there and depastured and trod them down with the same, and imprisoned her men and servants and kept them in prison until they made oath not to stay there any longer in her service.[117]

Obviously, this was an act done with the specific and overtly political intent of harming the

---

[114]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 68. Hardy also refers to Isabella and Alice as "heads of society" in this period. Hardy, Philippa of Hainault, p. 306.

[115]See Chapter Four.

[116]See Thomas Walsingham, Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani, ed. Henry Thomas Riley (Rolls Series 28:4 part 3), pp. 227-238.

[117]CPR 1374-77, p. 53.

interests of Alice Perrers. Moreover, that these men took the risk of making themselves easily identifiable by freeing their hostages made this not only a very courageous but also a very political act.

But if Edward's influence for Alice was weak in 1375, it became virtually nonexistant in 1376 with the holding of the Good Parliament. At this time Commons began its deliberations on the state of the king's government and especially the abuses of his courtiers. Interestingly, very little on the official record remains as to the trial and fate of Alice Perrers. In fact, the only note of her being of any importance to the proceedings in the official record comes in an ordinance forbidding women, and especially Alice Perrers, from meddling in the judgements of the king's courts.[118]

However, one of the chronicles of the period presents a somewhat more detailed picture. The Anonimalle Chronicle records, apparently verbatim, the speech of the Commons's Speaker, Peter de la Mare, on the subject of Alice Perrers:

> Another point was that a lady or a young lady, Dame Alice Perrers by name, had every year from the treasury of our Lord the King two or three thousand pounds of gold and silver from the coffers of our Lord the King without any notable profit and to the great damage of our lord the king: and it would be a great gain to the kingdom to remove the said dame from the presence of the king as a matter of conscience and of the ill prosecution of the war, so that the said sum could be restored to and could profit our Lord the King, and that the wardships of sons and daughters of great lords which belong to the king should not be too lightly given to those who are not able to profit or avail themselves of it.[119]

---

[118]"Whereas many women prosecute the suits of others in the courts of justice by way of maintenance, and to get profit thereby, which is displeasing to the King, he forbids any woman henceforward, and especially Alice Perrers, to do so, on pain of the said Alice forfeiting all her goods, and suffering banishment from the kingdom."(RP II, p. 329. Translated in Hardy, Philippa of Hainault, p. 307).

[119]Translated in Taylor, English Historical Literature, p. 308.

The Commons then, though somewhat indirectly, is attacking the king's policy towards his mistress. For, though the king is still sacred in the eyes of his subjects, his friends are not. Over the next two weeks, these charges are repeated, so the chronicler tells us, culminating in a virtual order from the Lords as well as the Commons for Edward III

> . . . to remove those who were of his council, and Dame Alice Perrers completely, informing him of their actions and how they had acted to deceive him, and that he should take to himself such councilors who wished loyally and profitably to govern [for him] and ordain for his estate and kingdom that he should not place faith and credence in evil councilors and wrongdoers.[120]

The tone of this passage is moralizing so as to protect the accusers from any accusations of disloyalty to the king. Rather it was their professed intent to protect him from evil councilors and make sure that he got what was rightfully his. Indeed, for Parliament to make the king swear that he would never allow Alice into his presence again, they had to hold the 'moral high ground.'[121]

In the opinion of the Commons, then, the king was no longer seen as influencing Alice's destiny but rather being influenced by it. Even the 'nonhistorical' tracts of the time attest

---

[120]Translated in Taylor, English Historical Literature, p. 311.

[121]Though he gives more colour to his account of the proceedings by adding what was going on off the main stage concerning Alice Perrers, Walsingham's discussion of her part in the Good Parliament mirror those of the Anonimalle Chronicle. His view on her crimes is summed up in the following passage:

> "Also, the community of the realm sought to be removed from the house and society of the king, a certain Alice Perrers, a impudent woman, who, behaving with excessive familiarity toward the king, caused many evil things to happen in the kingdom. She, surpassing the ways of women, sometimes dared to sit next to the judges of the king, sometimes next to the doctors in the Consistory, and persuade and dissuade for the sake of the defense of her interests, and argue against the law without shame; to the manifest scandal of the king, not only in this kingdom, but in regions far and remote."(Thomas Walsingham, Ypodigma Neustriae a Thomas Walsingham, Quondam Monacho Monasterii S. Albani, Conscriptum, ed. Henry Thomas Riley [Rolls Series 28:7], p. 322)

to this. At the same time that the Good Parliament was going on, Thomas Brinton, the Bishop of Rochester, in a sermon against courtiers of the king said that "it was neither decent nor safe that all the keys should hang on the belt of a single woman."[122] It is evident, then, that Edward was now not seen as the dominant member of the relationship who could aid the fortunes of his favourite, but rather as someone who was actually tied to her counsel as well as her fate.

Alice was pardoned of her crimes and allowed back into court by October of 1376, and this fact, it may be argued, proves the continuing influence of the king in Alice's life. However, this pardon had more to do with John of Gaunt's machinations for his own purposes, in his attempt to get the judgments of the Good Parliament reversed, than it had to do with the king's influence on Alice's behalf.[123] For, after the Good Parliament, dward's influence on behalf of Alice, if it had been tempered before, was now virtually nonexistent. As has been noted, she received only minor, noncontroversial grants after the Good Parliament and nothing in terms of land or money. The fact that she was again called to account for her actions a mere six months after Edwa:d's death and forced to forfeit all her property attests to this.[124]

---

[122]"Nec est decens vel tutum quod ad unius uxoris cingulum pendere debeant omnes claves." G.R. Owst, Literature and the Pulpit in Medieval England: A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters and of the English People (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), p. 580.

[123]It might also in part have simply been a result of a son's desire to fulfill the wishes of his father's last days. See Packe, King Edward III, p. 295. Moreover, while there is little question that Gaunt was in support of a reversal of the judgements of 1376(Tout, Chapters, 3:307-315; Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, 158-160), his power over the judgements of 1377 Hilary parliament in 1377 should not be overemphasized. See Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 165; for arguments against Gaunt's packing of the Hilary parliament, see J.C. Wedgewood, "John of Gaunt and the Packing of Parliament," English Historical Review 45 (1930):623-625.

[124]Perhaps Edward's last act for the sake of Alice's welfare may come in 1377 when he "probably arranged for the export of Alice Perrers' money and jewels to the value of 5000." Anthony Goodman, A History of England From Edward II to James I (London: Longman

CHAPTER THREE

Acquisitions by Alice Perrers

From the evidence presented to this point it is obvious that Alice Perrers was on the receiving end of a limited though structured fund of royal patronage. Indeed, though she received substantially more than most royal mistresses and definitely more than any female royal servant, it was a pittance compared to what a male courtier could get from a monarch.[125] However, she more than compensated for this shortcoming by her independent financial activities. In fact, she seems to have almost overcompensated for the restrictions placed upon her as a female courtier. She became much more involved in financial affairs than the majority of male favourites,[126] most likely because the basis of her relationship with the king was founded on a much more unstable premise. In such a situation, then, she was in definite need of independent financial security.

I Land and Other Material Acquisitions

Not surprisingly, Alice Perrers chose land as her primary form of investment. In the later medieval period, not only was it by far the safest way to store wealth, but it was also the most reliable route to a fairly high rate of investment income. Although loans offered a

---

Group, 1977), p. 174.

[125]One has only to look at the creation of Piers de Gaveston as Earl of Cornwall or the Edward III's rewards of titles to his loyal followers in 1337 to recognize this fact.

[126]Most of Edward's previous favourites were comrades from his struggles against the Mortimer faction. These men were handsomely rewarded with titles and land grants and therefore rarely seemed to have needed to get extensively involved with business transactions on the side. See Given-Wilson, The English Nobility, pp. 33-40; George Holmes, The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), pp. 8-9.

potentially higher return for investment, it was far more difficult to ensure even the initial investment outlay. Furthermore, the ownership of large amounts of land might have been a bid for respectability - something that her status was sadly lacking.

i) 1362-1369

Perrers' personal involvement in land dealings began with the aid to a purchase for another which appears in the Patent Rolls for December of 1362. In this transaction, the knight John de Mereworth enfeoffed Alice Perrers and the parson John de Hanneye of the manor of West Peckham, Kent, "for them to grant the same to him for life."[127] Clearly, then, Alice was involved in financial dealings with moderately important people long before she was getting land of her own from the king in 1367. Moreover she was becoming acquainted with the procedure of "uses", something she which would exploit extensively throughout her career and which will be discussed later in this chapter.

It took three more years for her to start acquiring her own land. When she did, however, it appears to have been a well-thought-out venture. On 18 November 1365 Alice Perrers was recorded in the Close Rolls as having entered into an agreement with Anthony de Lucy, son of Sir Thomas de Lucy,[128] concerning the manor of Radston in Northamptonshire.[129] In this transaction she agreed to give de Lucy 1000 marks in return for a life interest in the manor.

Though it might be questioned as to where a lady of the queen's bedchamber got this sort

---

[127]CPR 1361-64, p. 278.

[128]For a discussion of the de Lucy family, see G.E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage, Vol VIII (London: The Catherine Street Press, 1932), pp. 253-254.

[129]CCR 1364-68, p. 200.

of money so early in her career, and though it was recorded in the Close Rolls,[130] the king does not seem to have been directly involved. Indeed, Alice is recorded as being present at the chancery to acknowledge the terms of the agreement.[131] Secondly, despite the fact that the original source of money might have been the king in this early period, Alice nonetheless arranged payment for the manor from funds controlled by her.[132]

Furthermore, it is notable that her first private acquisition is not of a luxurious London town home or a comfortable manor as one might expect of someone who had recently obtained money or status, but of a manor which was simply for producing rental income:

> It contains buildings which are of no net value; 280 acres of arable land whereof one-half is worth 35s yearly, and the other worth nothing because it lies fallow and in common every year; 12 acres of meadow which can be mown every year, worth 16s yearly; a several pasture of 7 acres worth 2s 4d yearly; 36s rents of assize in the hands of free tenants; 17 6s 4d like rents in the hands of bond tenants . . . .[133]

Notably, this transaction was three years before she obtained any lands through royal patronage. However, it did take her two and a half years to finance the purchase of her next manor, Ardington. That this manor was again with high rental and agricultural incomes but little else[134] shows that, from the beginning, there was nothing haphazard in her land acquisition policy. The first step in the deal is in May of 1368 when it was recorded that she

---

[130]The closed letters of royal administrational correspondence. See Elton, England 1200-1640, pp. 39-40.

[131] As noted in a memorandum connected with the agreement stating that she showed up to acknowledge the terms of the agreement at the chancery. CCR 1364-68, p. 200.

[132]Namely, she cancelled a loan owed to her by de Lucy. See Chapter Four.

[133]CIM 1377-88, p. 8.

[134]CIM 1377-88, pp. 3-5.

had made an agreement with John de Cobeham,[135] knight, "son of Mary sometime Countess Marshal, the king's aunt".[136] In this Patent Roll entry de Cobeham agreed to demise the manor to Alice for his lifetime for a rent of 80 pounds. Alice in turn entered on to the land without the king's licence, an act which may be considered somewhat out of the ordinary considering her relationship to the king. But what is of more interest is when the "said John quitclaimed to her all right in the manor, and surrendered his estate therein and the said rent . . . <that> Alice holds the manor discharged from rent".[137] It is obvious from the secretive nature of aspects of these transactions - entering on the land without the king's licence and an unrecorded transaction concerning the transfer of the land from de Cobeham to Perrers - that Alice was already resorting to unofficial channels in order to get the lands that she wanted.[138]

Moreover, six weeks later this negotiating continued. For at that time she enfeoffed John de Hanneye, John de Ploufeld, and William Gresleye with the manor.[139] Interestingly, although Ardington, along with the manor of Meon Stoke, Hampshire,[140] was still listed

---

[135]According to Tout, later a "stalwart of the baronial opposition" on the minority council of Richard II and a player in the crises of 1386-88. See Tout, Chapters, 3:327, 425 footnote 3.

[136]CPR 1367-70, p. 125.

[137]CPR 1367-70, p. 125.

[138]Of course, as the land was held in chief, it had to be granted by the king for Alice to get full possession. It is also obvious, however, by the form that the transaction took, that the transfer of lands was between de Cobeham and Alice, with the king only ratifying it afterwards.

[139]CPR 1367-70, p. 147.

[140]This transaction shows that Alice's business associates also used an aggressive tone in their dealings. De Hanneye, de Ploufeld, and Greseleye are noted as first acquiring the manor from the previous owner, Thomas de la Bere, without licence. This was granted to these men on the same day, 15 July 1368, by the king. CPR 1367-70, p. 147.

as in their possession in 1372,[141] when the forfeiture proceedings came to the point of taking inventories in late 1377, these manors are listed as being in Alice's possession.[142] Evidently, she must have made an agreement whereby she would unofficially continue to hold and receive issue from the manor.[143]

Her last land transaction in this period was her part in the Earl of Stafford's acquisition of the manor of Mulcote, Warwickshire. On the Friday before Michaelmas in 1369, John de Peyto, knight, alienated the manor to "Ralph, Earl of Stafford, Hugh Stafford, his son, knight, Richard de Stafford his brother, knight, and Alice Perrers for their lives."[144]

Alice's connection with the Staffords in this transaction are not specified directly but there are some clues as to her role. As with Ardington earlier, the transaction was recorded as being completed without the king's licence.[145] It would appear likely that Alice's presence among the feoffees was her cut for eventually clearing the deal with the king. Since Alice is not listed as having any hold on this manor at the time of her forfeiture, she must then have allowed herself to be bought out by the other members of the transaction. But not only did this use of influence help add to the wealth of Alice, it also had the potential for establishing links with a powerful noble family, for the Staffords were on the queen's[146]

---

[141]CPR 1370-74, p. 198.

[142]CIM 1377-88, pp. 3-5.

[143]And for which allowance was made provision for in the 1377 proceedings concerning her forfeiture. See CFR 1377-83, p. 51.

[144]CIM 1372-77, p. 318; see also CPR 1370-74, p. 301.

[145]CPR 1370-74, p. 301.

[146]Tout, Chapters, 3:395.

and the Black Prince's staffs;[147] further, the elder Stafford had been a trusted servant of Edward III since the 1340's.[148]

ii) 1370-1373

Alice was not only in the business of acquiring ownership of manors. She was also more than willing to purchase anything which might increase her income. Thus, on 12 December 1369, the king committed to Alan de Buxhill, underchamberlain, the "keeping of the lands late of Joan de Orby, who held in chief, together with the marriage of the heir."[149] At some point between December 12 and May 14 of the next year de Buxhill then transferred the same wardship to Alice Perrers.[150] The reason why this transaction took place between de Buxhill and Perrers is not stated but it may be conjectured that it was in order to help de Buxhill cover the costs of his stint in France as a king's lieutenant and the Captain of St. Sauvier.[151] As with other such deals, the transfer of the wardship was originally simply between de Buxhill and Perrers which the king later ratified.[152] When royal approval was

---

[147]Tout, Chapters, 5:51.

[148]Tout, Chapters, 3:327-328. For a discussion of the fortunes of the Stafford family, see K.B. McFarlane, The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and Related Studies (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 201-203.

[149]CPR 1367-70, p. 437.

[150]CPR 1367-70, p. 437.

[151]This, however, was a very unfortunate posting, considering the controversy over its surrender to the French in 1375. See C.C. Bayley, "The Campaign of 1375 and the Good Parliament," English Historical Review 55 (1940):370-383. Buxhill's career is documented in Tout, Chapters, 3:235, 277, 309, 339-340, 366.

[152]"And, if a man held only a minute portion of land from the Crown in chief, its rights of 'prerogative wardship' was then exercised over all the feudal holdings of the deceased, together with the wardship of the body and the marriage of the heir." J.M.W. Bean, From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), p. 140.

given, the dowry lands of the lately deceased mother, Margaret, were also included.[153] Finally, in 1376, Alice obtained control of the lands which Walter de Hamby held by knight service of Margaret's heir.[154] Piece by piece, then, Alice Perrers managed to complete her hold on the wardship of the substantial estate of John de Orby (d.1353).[155]

This determined business sense also seems to have been paramount in the most complicated and perplexing of Alice's land transactions, the case of the manor of Compton Mordak in Warwickshire.[156] In April of 1370, Sir Thomas Mordak granted the "capital messuage" of the manor to William de Greseleye, John Ploufeld, and John Vyncent.[157] These men had been, and would continue to be, close business associates of Alice and it is obvious that they were acting on her behalf. By November of the next year it was in her possession.[158] However, she then reenfeoffed it to de Greseleye, Ploufeld, and

---

[153]CPR 1367-70, p. 437. If looked at alone, the second part of this transaction could be argued to be strictly royal patronage and therefore placed in the first chapter, the fact that Alice initiated the transaction, and that it was obviously her choice in the transaction that made the king give her the second part, still makes this in essence a transaction made by Alice's independent initiative. Moreover, the fact that this transaction, even though it was only dealing with wardships, was around her area of preference - this time in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Sussex - all speaks of her control of the transaction.

[154]See Chapter Two. CPR 1374-77, p. 236.

[155]This substantial estate included the manors of Danseye and Bradwell in Essex, Hunmanby and West Witton in Yorkshire, Tibenham and Buckenham in Norfolk and many smaller parcels of land spread throughout eastern England. CIPM Vol. X, pp. 94-96. For the heirs'portions of this estate, see CIPM Vol. XII, pp. 388-89, 426.

[156]This transaction is discussed in some depth in the Times Literary Supplement. See Times Literary Supplement 3 July 1919, 17 July 1919.

[157]Warwickshire Feet of Fines, ed. Lucy Drucker. Vol. 3 (1345-1509)(London: Dugdale Society, 1943), p. 52. See also CIM 1377-88, p. 3; VCH: Warwickshire, 5:58.

[158]VCH:Warwickshire, 5:58. And, from the Plea Rolls for the County of Warwickshire, she seems, at least at this time, to have taken the ownership of the manor seriously: "Alice Perrers sued John Straunge for forcibly breaking into her free warren at Compton Mordak, and chasing and taking her rabbits and hares and partridges." Collections for a History of

Vyncent.[159] In 1373, de Greseleye and his associates enfeoffed another group of Alice's long time business partners with the manor.[160] But the story does not end there. Alice at some point between February of 1373 and August of 1374 gave full control of the manor to Robert Broun and he then granted it back to her in exchange for the manor of Farndon by Woodford, Northamptonshire, which he and John Ploufeld had been granted on Alice's behalf by Richard Moton, vicar of Ravensthorp, and John Wauter, "of Wolde", chaplain.[161] Finally in December of 1374, she granted the manor to William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, though only for a limited term.[162] This, then, is perhaps the most complex of Alice's dealings and somewhat difficult to fathom. The manor appears to have been a "floating" property in Alice's portfolio and may have been used as an inducement to finalize deals. But this is conjectural. What is certain is that Alice had a facility with such transactions.

However, there were times when she simply purchased land - for example, the manor of Wendover in Buckinghamshire.[163] While this was a piece of property which had passed

---

Staffordshire, ed. William Salt Archaeological Society, Vol. 13 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1892), p. 88.

[159]VCH: Warwickshire, 5:58.

[160]Namely, John Bernes, William Mulsho, Edward de Chirdestoke, John de Freton, and Robert Broun. CCR 1369-74, p. 535.

[161]CIM 1377-88, p. 9. Broun, for what reason we do not know, wanted this property in particular for he had been "ploughing,reploughing, sowing, and manuring it at his pleasure ever since May 51 Edward III(1377)." The fact that he waited two and a half years to bring his desperately desired land purchase to fruition also lends credence to the idea that he was unable to get hold of the land for himself from the previous owners. It is not untenable that his delay in actual use of the land was caused by disputes with his overlords.

[162]Cokayne, The Complete Peerage Vol. XII, pt. 2, p. 879.

[163]Wendover was originally said to be held by William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, who returned it to the king at some time before 1371. Seldon Society: Select Cases Before the King's Council: 1243-1482, ed. I.S. Leadam and J.F. Baldwin (Cambridge:

between the king and Alice in December of 1371, in this case, perhaps because of its prominence as a royal manor, this seems a straightforward business transaction rather than a case of royal patronage. Indeed, Alice only obtained the manor after she had signed over to the king "all her lands she lately held in the towns of Wilmington,Stone, Southflete, and Mersh, co. Kent" which she had been given by Nicholas de Holbourne, Thomas de Berre, and John de Brewode.[164] She was also required to give the king 500 pounds before full rights in Wendover were granted.[165]

The reason for the almost strained legality of this transaction was due to the identity of the manor, for this was a piece of property which had royal connections all the way back to Edward the Confessor[166] and was a link in a chain of royal retreats spread through the southern counties.[167] Hence, by granting giving Alice this manor, not only was Edward depriving the treasury of much needed revenue, he was also giving away an identifiable apart of the royal patrimony. Legality in such an obviously public affair was, then, of the utmost importance. [168]

Harvard University Press, 1918), p. xxxiii.

[164]CPR 1370-74, p. 161.

[165]Although not a case of outright patronage, there is still more than a hint of royal favouritism involved since she clearly wanted the Wendover lands more than the king wanted the Kentish lands with which he later proposed "to endow the house of the order of Preachers lately founded at Dertford".CPR 1370-74, p. 161.

[166]Kay goes into a detailed discussion of the site and state of the manor. See Kay, Lady of the Sun, pp. 80-81.

[167]Such as Windsor Park, Sheen, Berkhamsted , Havering and Eltham. See Tout, Chapters, 3:286-287.

[168]It is also an interesting fact that when her husband, William de Windsor, petitioned to get her lands back in 1380, this was the only one of consequence that was not returned. See CPR 1377-81, pp. 503-504.

The use of straight cash, however, was not her usual means of land acquisition and the transaction consequently seems to have temporarily depleted Alice's liquid funds. As a result, she did not make any major manorial purchase for the next year. Sometime in 1373, however, she did renew her land acquisitions, though notably in the form of leases. The first of these was the rental of the manor of Drayton in Berkshire for the sum of 20 marks per year for life.[169] The manor itself was obviously a manor geared to agricultural production because, as is noted in the forfeiture proceedings in 1377, she had on this land

> three cart horses worth 10s each, a cart with gear worth 6s 8d, 8 plough oxen worth 9s each, a plough with gear worth 3s 4d, a boar worth 2s 6d, 4 sows with 18 suckling pigs worth 10s and 15 young pigs worth 12d each; in the barn and granary by estimation 40 quarters of wheat worth 2s 8d net, the quarter and 40 quarters of barley and dredge worth 2s net the quarter.[170]

Indeed, rental agreements tended to be her preferred form of acquisition throughout this year. Both Gunnersbury with an attached messuage and two acres of land at Brentford in Middlesex and the manor of Pallingswyk (Ravenscourt) in Fulham were leased sometime in 1373. These manors were originally held by John de Ceppeham[171] who gave it up to the bishop of London. The bishop then leased Gunnersbury and Pallingswyk to Alice Perrers

---

[169]"Commission to Thomas Doyly, John Salvayne and Gilbert Wace, sheriff of Berks [sic] to enquire concerning the petition (Ancient Petition 11182) exhibited in Parliament by Elizabeth, late the wife of Gilbert De Elesfeld, deceased, for the removal of the king's hand from the manor of Drayton whereof they were jointly enfeoffed by Gilbert de Burghfeld and Nicholas de Steventon, chaplains, her husband having granted it for life to Edmund Roose at a yearly rent of 20 marks and he his interest to Alice Perrers." (CIM 1377-88, p. 59; See also CIM 1377-88, p. 45).

[170]CIM 1377-81, pp. 4-5.

[171]There is some confusion as to the previous ownership of this manor. While the VCH puts the ownership to John of Ceppeham, Windsor's petition is more ambiguous, suggesting that it might have been held by a London goldsmith named John de Northwych. See CPR 1377-81, p. 503.

for a rent of 36s 8d[172] and 21s 1d per year respectively.[173] The rents themselves were clearly below market value.[174]

Both Gunnersbury and Pallingswyk were useful acquisitions for Alice. Conveniently situated between London and the royal manors in the western counties, the former manor seems to have been a provisioning manor[175] for the latter which was one of her main residences in the London area:[176]

> This manor is well supplied with buildings, such as halls, chapels, chambers, kitchens, bakehouses, stables and barns . . . . It contains two gardens worth no more than 18d yearly because the orchards had been felled, 40 acres of arable land worth 26s 8d yearly, 60 acres of pasture worth 20s, 1 1/2 acres of meadows worth 5s and 6s rents of assizes.[177]

Another important manor in the London area obtained during this time was Upminster.

---

[172]CIM 1377-88, p. 12.

[173]CIM 1377-1388, p. 12. Kay suggests that the transaction may have been in exchange for influence, and indeed considering the substantially reduced rent for these lands, one must wonder about the motives behind the transaction. Kay, Lady of the Sun, p. 85.

[174]The actual market cost - that is the amount that the crown leased the land for after Alice's forfeiture - was 106s 8d per annum. CFR 1377-81, p. 169.

[175] The entry speaks for itself as a supply manor: "The site of the manor, with the close and other buildings and a dovecote in ruins is of no net value. There are 140 acres of arable land worth 46s 8d yearly; 3(1) of them are sown with wheat, and the crop is worth 62s only, because it was sown in rainy weather. There are 80 acres of pasture worth 13s 4d, 4 acres of meadow worth 6s and 4 acres of wood of no value because they were felled the (year) before last and the roots destroyed by) beasts . . . . The said Alice has the following goods there: - 5 plough-stots in poor condition worth 25s, 6 oxen and 4 young oxen(bovetti) . . . ." See CIM 1377-88, pp. 12-13.

[176]"This was probably Alice's most luxurious residence, and an entirely private one which she maintained as a personal home for herself and her daughters." Kay, Lady of the Sun, p. 166.

[177]CIM 1377-88, p. 12. Walsingham also speaks of Alice spending time at Pallingswyk. See Walsingham, Chronicon Angliae, p. 98.

This manor and its connected lands were obtained by Alice in late 1373 from the son of Sir John de Havering. The condition of tenure was that "three kinsmen and the next heirs quitclaimed the reversion of Gaynes and other manors to feoffees of Alice Perrers."[178] These other manors, also purchased from the de Havering family, included the manor of West Newlands, Essex. William Aucy, kinsman and heir of Robert de Havering, along with two unnamed women, who had claimed that "they were the next Roberts' coheirs of the said two-thirds and reversion," were "caused" by Alice to enfeoff two thirds of West Newlands, Essex, to her long term business associates Robert Broun, John Vyncent, Nicholas Clay, and Edmund de Clay "to her use and herself took the profits of the said two-thirds."[179] This part manor seems to have been more difficult to acquire but demonstrates her continued drive to obtain more income-producing manors.

From the status of the individuals with whom she was now dealing, Alice appears to have begun buying from people she came in contact with at court for lands close to London. At some time in the year before 12 September, Alice obtained the knight's fee of Bushey and Bekeswell in Hertfordshire,[180] held of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex.[181] Connected with this property was the manor of Bourne Hall in the county of Hertfordshire,[182] which included two tenements called Hartsbourne and Marlesputtes, a

---

[178]VCH:Essex 7:149; Haldeen Braddy refers to this manor as being "by the king's gift", but there is no evidence to support this statement. Braddy, "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers," p. 223.

[179]CIM 1377-88, p. 10.

[180]CIPM Vol. 13, p. 143.

[181]See Appendix Three for full listing of citations.

[182]This was almost certainly connected with Bushey and Bekeswell, seeing that all three were owned by the same men.

tenement called Latermeres, and one called Halles, and a carucate of land called Totenhalle.[183] These lands seem to have been for purely rental income purposes and perhaps as a minor base of food supply for her London- area manors.[184]

As a result of growing confidence, towards the end of this phase in her career, Alice seems to have stepped up another ingredient to her land acquisition policy - the active use of her status. That she was not above using her position vis-a-vis the king to arrange the purchases of the land that she wanted may be seen in the following transaction which took place in December of 1373 concerning the manor of Weston by Cherington in Warwickshire. This transaction, however, has a complicated history. Going back to the reign of Edward II, it was held by the Segrave family who eventually granted it in life interest to Walter de Chiriton with reversion to William de Peyto.[185] However, de Chiriton, because of debts owed to the king as well as certain other dealings,[186] was forced to forfeit this land to the crown. De Peyto, having the right of the reversion,[187] protested but it seems that Alice used her position with the king in order to get the lands granted to John Vyncent and Robert Broun to her use.[188] It is interesting, however, that in the original grant to Broun and Vyncent on December 29, 1373, it is not mentioned as being given to her use[189] and

---

[183]CIM 1377-88, pp. 10-11.

[184]CIM 1377-88, p. 11.

[185]Victoria County History: Warwickshire, 5:54.

[186]It would seem that de Chiriton was potentially as sharp an operator as Perrers. According to the Patent Rolls, "the said Walter had acquired in fee simple a messuage and a carucate of land in Benchesham in the parish of Croydon with moneys borrowed by him by pledging the king's jewels without licence." (December 20, 1372). CPR 1370-74, p. 231.

[187]Victoria County History: Warwickshire, 5:58.

[188]CCR 1385-89, p.78; see also CPR 1370-74, p. 385.

[189]But it was often customary to note any such arrangements. See CPR 1370-74, p. 385.

therefore must have been the result of a private arrangement made at a later date.[190]

iii) 1374-1377

The period 1374-1377 saw a slight decline in Alice Perrers' land dealings, although less than the rate of decline of her gifts from the king in this period. Interestingly, an increasing number of the transactions from this time had the provision from the beginning that they would be held by others for her use. The first of these was the manor of Colworth, Northamptonshire. This was obtained on 9 June 1374 from John and William de Missenden, who gave full control of the manor and "two mills, one toft three carucates of land and all other lands etc. in the town of Colworthe" to John Bernes, William Mulsho, Edward de Cherdestok, John de Freton, and Robert Broun,[191] which was then privately arranged to be actually held by Alice and for her to get the profits from the manor.[192] The manor itself is a mixture of a farm and a revenue producing manor, judging from the demesne land under cultivation as well as 106s 8d in rents coming from the land.[193] Bernes, Mulsho, et al., appear to have been determined to make this manor a going concern for Alice, as a month later they also petitioned and were granted by the king the right to the weekly market in Colworth as well as the yearly fair.[194]

---

[190] That she was considered in actual possession of the manor is evident in the fact that not only was it held as forfeit in 1377(CFR 1377-83, pp. 66, 75; CIM 1377-88, p. 3), but that it was also regained by Windsor in 1380(CPR 1377-81, p. 504).

[191] CCR 1369-74, p. 77; see also CCR 1369-74, p. 82.

[192] That it was actually owned by her(though by private arrangement) is shown in that not only is it listed as among her lands held at the time of her forfeiture, but also by the fact that it was among the ones that de Windsor regained in 1380. See CIM 1377-88, pp. 8-9; CFR 1377-83, pp. 51, 181; CPR 1377-81, p. 503.

[193] CIM 1377-88, p. 8.

[194] Calender of Charter Rolls, Vol. 5, p. 229.

The year 1375 saw three major acquisitions by Alice Perrers. The first was two-thirds of the manor of Stoke Maundevil of which little is known except that it was again a case of her gaining land and then immediately enfeoffing it to Robert Broun and John Freton to her use.[195] More important was her purchase of a property called Coldharbour along the banks of the Thames in London.[196] Previously owned by Sir John Poultney, draper and four times mayor of London (d.1349), it was then leased to the Earl of Salisbury.[197] There seems to have been a fair amount of building done on this site by Alice, "including a house now known as Le Toure"[198]. This, along with the tenement previously owned by Thomas de Swanland, both in the parish of All Hallows the Less, Dowgate Ward, London, seems to have been the principle residences for Alice in the city.

Finally, in this year there were the grants by Robert Ashton, treasurer, of seven manors and associated lands in southwestern England to John Cary, William Mulsho, John Bernes, Edward de Cherdestoke, John de Freton, and Robert Broun "to the use and profit while sole of Alice de Perrers"[199] probably in exchange for certain loans.[200] When Alice married William de Windsor,[201] by previous agreement she gave these manors back to Ashton and accepted their reversion upon his death as compensation. These manors included Poorstock and Litton in Dorset, Knowle and Lydford in Somerset, as well as three manors in Sutton

---

[195]CIM 1377-88, p. 1.

[196]Margaret Galway, "Alice Perrers' Son John," p. 243.

[197]Myers, London in the Age of Chaucer, p. 27.

[198]Times Literary Supplement, 17 July 1919.

[199]CCR 1381-85, p. 354. That these manors were actually owned by her is shown in that their reversion was given to de Windsor in 1380. CPR 1377-81, p. 503.

[200]See Chapter Four

[201]The exact date is unknown but it became public as a result of the Good Parliament of 1376. See Chapter Four.

Veney, Wiltshire.[202] What is interesting is that Ashton was the key inquisitor into administration of Ireland by William de Windsor when charges of misadministration were levelled in 1372.[203] By 1375, however, he was obviously reconciled enough to the court to be granting lands to Alice.

Her business activity seems to have gone into limbo during 1376, probably due to the Good Parliament and the aftermath of uncertainty which existed about her future. The only transaction of the year was of the manor of Morton in March of 1376. This was for a term of seven years, was held from one Thomas Sarysm, and was worth 10 marks a year.[204] However, in June of the next year she acquired the parcel of manors of Moor End and the connected manor of Lillington Dansey obtained from John de Ypres, steward of the royal household.[205] The castle itself seems to have been the main residence for Alice in this area of England:

> June 5, 1377(Sheen)-Grant for life to Alice de Perreres of as much wood for fuel within the forest of Whittlewode as she shall need from time to time for her stay at the castle of Morsende, and of as many oaks for timber in the forest as she shall need for the repair of the castle and the houses and buildings pertaining thereto.[206]

This was her last land acquisition, just days before the death of the king, and notably, as with the acquisition of the previous year, it was only leased for a limited term. It would

---

[202]CPR 1381-85, p. 386.

[203]See S. Harbison, "William of Windsor, the Court Party and the Administration of Ireland," in James Lydon, ed., England and Ireland in the Middle Ages (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981), pp. 158-62.

[204]CIM 1377-88, pp. 8-9.

[205]CPR 1374-77, p. 477; A Victoria History for the County of Buckinghamshire, 4 vols. (London: Dawsons Press, 1969), 4:195. It seems that a manor called Plumpton Purye, also held by de Ypres, was part of the transaction even though it is specifically stated as not being parcel with the castle or manor of Moorend. See CIM 1377-88, pp. 6-9.

[206]CPR 1374-77, p. 477.

seem that either Alice, or those individuals doing business with her, did not foresee a stable future for her after the death of the king.

II Loans

It may be considered a sign of Alice Perrers' economic power even at this early stage that she was not recorded as being in debt to any one except perhaps the king. There is no evidence to suggest that she ever had to make any private credit arrangements to purchase any of her properties in this period. Granted, she might have been getting some money 'under the table' from the king. However, the amount of money which she was paying out for manors such as Rodeston and Wendover would have definitely, as was stated before, shown up in the accounts of the chamber if they had been given in lump sums.

This state of things continued through the 1370's. Indeed, considering that this was perhaps her most prosperous period both in terms of official gifts from the king and of business transactions in her own right, it is no wonder that she had little need of loans from others. This is not to say that she was not sometimes an intermediary for money which, though destined for others, could also help her. Perhaps the most blatant example of this was the king's grant of 1615 pounds to de Windsor which went through the hands of Alice.[207] In this case, it is probably not too great an assumption, as one historian has pointed out, that Alice also received back some of the money from de Windsor.[208]

III Influence

There is little doubt that Alice began early to develop her own power and influence. Part of this may be due to the fact that at some time around 1364, Alice bore a son, John,

---

[207]Issues of the Exchequer, p. 197.

[208]Howard, Chaucer, p. 204.

commonly believed to be the king's, who was later to be brought up at court.[209] This obviously helped to cement the relationship between Edward and Alice, for most medieval kings, if they were nothing else, were usually helpful to their bastard children. Edward in particular was known to be on very good grounds with his children by Philippa, an attitude which seems to have extended to Alice's son, judging from the arrangements made for his welfare.[210]

More important to her later career was the creation of a network of supporters. A central issue here was her growing preference for the mechanism of uses, something she had experimented with as early as the West Peckham transaction(1362). Though she did not hold her own land until three years later, she obviously recognized that this was a safe way to protect one's landed interests. Ardington, the first manor which Alice held in full right (1368), was the first of her properties to be enfeoffed. Interestingly, a mere ten weeks elapsed before she saw fit to enfeoff it to John de Hanneye, a participant in her first business transaction back in 1362, John de Ploufeld, and William Greseleye.[211] It might at first seem odd that Alice should readily give up her first full grant and merely take the profits but here Alice was following the well known practice of uses. For, by enfeoffing Ardington, not only did Alice free herself from the administrational duties connected with owning a manor, but she also evaded any chance of the manor going into wardship or

---

[209]Chris Given-Wilson and Alice Curteis, The Royal Bastards of Medieval England (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 138. S. Harbison, "William of Windsor, the Court Party and the Administration of Ireland,' in James Lydon, ed., England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981), pp. 154-155. She is also said to have had other illegitimate children, most interestingly one named Cecily Chaumpaigne who seems to have been "ravished or abducted"(depending on the translation) by the poet Geoffrey Chaucer in the early 1380's. See Braddy, "Chaucer, Alice Perrers, and Cecily Chaumpaigne," p. 906.

[210]See Chapter Four. A good discussion of Edward's relations with his children may be found in Prestwich, The Three Edwards, pp. 276-283.

[211]CPR 1367-70, p. 140.

escheating to the king after she died. Moreover, when she died, it was the enfeoffees who became the legal owners of the land. They in turn, if an arrangement had been made before Alice's death, could either give Alice's heirs issues from the land, or else, depending upon her wishes, enfeoff the heirs themselves. Therefore, she never had to worry about the manor going into wardship or escheating to the crown, or even the payment of land transfer taxes because she did not, legally at least, own the land.[212]

However, the process of enfeoffment was double edged for the enfeoffor. For, by enfeoffing his or her land, the enfeoffor no longer had legal hold over the land though he/she still probably retained a grip on it by private agreement with the enfeoffees. To this end Alice Perrers learned to use the process wisely, enfeoffing only groups of individuals whom she knew well:

> August 26, 1372(Preston by Sanwich)Licence for Alice Perrers to enfeoff John de Bernes, citizen of London, William de Mulsho, clerk, Edward de Cherdestoke, clerk, John de Freton, clerk, and Robert Broun of Warrewyk of the manors of Wendover, co. Buckingham, and Hanneye, alias Philbert, in the town of Esthanneye, Berkshire, held in chief; and for William de Greseleye, clerk, John de Ploufeld, Clerk, and John Vyncent of London to enfeoff the same of the manors of Meonstoke, co. Southampton, and Ardyngton, co. Berks, likewise held in chief.[213]

Of these men, Mulsho, de Cherdestoke, Freton, Broun, de Greseleye, Ploufeld and Vyncent were all individuals with whom she had dealt previously. But even if one individual was not trustworthy, by enfeoffing groups of men she increased her chances of at least some of them staying loyal to her and so forstalling any attempted usurpation of her ownership of the lands involved.

---

[212]For a discussion of uses, see Chris Given-Wilson, The English Nobility in the Later Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century Political Community (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), pp. 139-153.

[213]CPR 1370-74, p. 198.

This policy is further evident in February of the next year when de Greseleye and associates confirmed all of the above enfeoffments as well as enfeoffing the Bernes' group with the following list of possessions:

> the manor of Drayton and all other lands in those towns, the manor of Compton Murdak, co. Warrewyk, the manor of Bornehall by Watford and all other lands in the parishes of Shenleye, Aldenham, Parksokene and le Rugge co Hertford, the manors of Gonyldesbury and Palyngeswiche, a tenement in Brynford and all other lands rents and services in the parish of Fulham co. Middlesex sometime of John de Northwych, goldsmith, and all other, lands tenements or messuages in the city of London and in Bermoundesheye.[214]

Her close ties to this group and the trust between her and them is evident not only in the consistent way that they appear in her business transactions,[215] but also by the fact that the group of enfeoffees did in turn give the manors back on request without any apparent fuss. It is also evident that when Alice fell from grace in 1377, most of her associates also suffered.[216]

"Uses" seem, then, to have been the main safeguard used by Alice in order to protect her gains. Indeed Alice appears to have rarely seen herself in need of any influence on her behalf up until the mid 1370's, save that of the king and the loyalty of her business

---

[214]CPR 1370-74, p. 535. That these lands were still controlled by her is evident not only because they were specifically confiscated in her forfeiture in December of 1377(CIM 1377-88, pp. 1-17) but also because they were also regained by her husband, William de Windsor, as being in her possession at the time of forfeiture(CPR 1377-81, pp. 503-504)

[215]It is also notable that most of her enfeoffees have also had dealings with de Windsor while he was in Ireland. For examples, see CPR 1370-74, pp. 331, 416.

[216]Whereas before they were getting grants from not only Alice but also from the king as well as judgements in their favour and the allowance of infractions on the law(for examples, see CPR 1370-74, pp. 113, 195, 162, 385; CCharR Vol. 5, p. 229.) after the death of the king and the subsequent demise of Alice, not only are these men given no more in terms of royal grants, instead they actually seem to have been singled out by the new regime for harsh treatment.(There are even instances of revocations of grants. See CPR 1374-77, p. 123, 124).

associates. There is, however, one important exception to this statement - namely, the talk of an alliance with John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. For Gaunt was probably the only person in the kingdom aside from the king who rivalled Alice's power both in terms of influence with the king and landed wealth.[217] Thus some historians saw her as a tool of Gaunt, a means by which to control both the court circle and the king.[218] It was, indeed, evident that Gaunt took the initiative in getting the courtiers reinstated to their holdings in the fall of 1376.[219] He is also said to have helped her and her husband, William de Windsor, have the 1377 judgement against her repealed in 1379,[220] which lead to her being restored, though in her husband's name, to most of her holdings in 1380.[221]

But the debate concerning her relationship with Lancaster can also swing the other way. Armitage-Smith argues that Alice was seen by Gaunt as a rival to his power at court and with the king, and that he therefore had more to gain than to lose from her fall.[222] Though this is a good theory, it would be very difficult to prove that Gaunt actually felt that way. Indeed, the only evidence that Armitage-Smith gives to back up his point is that Gaunt went after Alice's London properties after her forfeiture in 1377. However, this could have merely been simply good business sense on the part of Gaunt rather than any malice toward

---

[217]Most of the work on John of Gaunt is fairly antiquated. Exceptions are various articles by Anthony Goodman including "John of Gaunt" in England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium W.M. Ormrod, ed.(Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1986): 67-87; Anthony Goodman, "John of Gaunt: Paradigm of the Late Fourteenth Century Crisis," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society Fifth Series, Vol. 37(1987): 133-148.

[218]Packe, King Edward III, p. 302; Cammidge, The Black Prince, p. 434.

[219]Tout, Chapters, 3:307-311.

[220]Tout, Chapters, 3:346.

[221]CPR 1377-81, p. 503-504.

[222]Sydney Armitage-Smith, John of Gaunt (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1904), p. 129.

Alice.

The truth of the matter probably lies in between these two extremes. Though Gaunt probably backed her as a useful second in the court and control of the king, he had no love of Alice. This was not simply because of her power, but also because of her constant aid to William of Wykeham, who remained a friend of hers into the 1380's, and was also a critic of William Latimer, one of Gaunt creatures.[223]

Alice Perrers' own fate was thus caught up in whom she kept as friends. For most of her career she tended to focus her energies on her relationships with the king and a group of lower level clerks. Indeed, perhaps the main reason for her downfall in the Good Parliament was her lack of powerful allies. Of the new council of nobles and churchmen to aid in royal policy called for by the commons in the Good Parliament, Wykeham was the only one whom she could call an ally.[224] Thus while her limited allegiances left her free to act almost without restraint, when times turned bad in the mid-1370's,[225] this lack of any firm political alliance with any side was paramount to her undoing.

---

[223]See Chapter Four

[224]Anonimalle Chronicle, p. 90.

[225]Reasons for the worsening of the political situation which resulted in the Good Parliament are seen as threefold by George Holmes: the deterioration of English fortunes in France since the renewal of the war in 1369, financial misadministration at home, and the policies of Pope Gregory XI. See Holmes, The Good Parliament, pp. 7-99.

CHAPTER FOUR

Patronage to Others

To facilitate her own accumulation of wealth and power, Alice had, of course, to resort to patronage of her own. There were certainly practical reasons why she should wish to spread her largesse about. First, she had to keep the loyalty of those who served her. Though, as we have seen, she had very few connections whose influence was greater than her own, she still had to make sure that those who worked for her were content. Secondly, she was well aware that, in the form of loans, her wealth could be used profitably. For, though we do not know the level of interest that she charged when she lent out money, if it was even anywhere near the 50 percent that her fellow courtiers had charged the king on a 20 000 mark loan,[226] this would have been a very lucrative enterprise.

I Land and Other Material Acquisitions

Up until 1369, she had little in terms of property to give away. Nonetheless, as has been stated, she did have the perception of land as a commodity. Hence she was not averse to granting the odd piece of land if it was to help her later on. Her treatment of the manor of Monylaws, Northumberland illustrates this attitude. The manor was granted on 30 July 1368 to Alice Perrers "and her heirs" by the king.[227] Instead of enfeoffing it to others for her use, however, on 16 July 1369, she granted it for life to Henry del Strother.[228] This act, however, was not without self interest. Indeed, it seems that she was specifically trying to

---

[226]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 109.

[227]CPR 1367-70, p. 146.

[228]CPR 1367-70, p. 292.

gain del Strother's favour. For it turns out that del Strother, aside from being a member of the peerage, was also the sheriff of Northumberland and the keeper of the castle of Newcastle upon Tyne.[229] Add this to the fact that William de Windsor was the sheriff of Cumberland and the keeper of the castle of Carlisle,[230] and it can be safely said that Alice had developed a firm network of powerful friends in order to look after her northern wardships.

After this, however, she made no land grants until 1375. This hiatus more or less coincides with the rise in her own land accumulation and is therefore somewhat understandable. Indeed, any acts of patronage involving land throughout her career were done with very specific goals in mind. The most important land grant was to her son, John de Southam.[231] In September of 1373, he had gained, obviously as a result of Alice's influence, an annuity of 100 pounds from the king out of the farm of the city of London.[232] In the next year he gained another annuity for the same amount on 29 Sept 1374.[233] In October of 1375, de Southam was given clothes from Edward III's wardrobe and was treated essentially as a member of the household.[234]

But perhaps Alice's most important act towards her son came in 1376, when she made

---

[229]CFR 1356-68, p. 328.

[230]CFR 1356-68, p. 328.

[231]For a detailed discussion of her son, see Galway, "Alice Perrers's Son John," pp. 242-46. See also Given-Wilson, Royal Bastards, pp. 138-142.

[232]CPR 1377-81, p. 102.

[233]CCR 1374-77, p. 48.

[234]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 69; Given-Wilson, Royal Bastards, p. 138.

over to him the manor of Hitchin.[235] At first, Alice simply went after a dower portion of the manor in exchange for the defeasance of a debt of 200 pounds owed to Alice by William de Croyser,[236] who appeared to have had held control of the previous owner's wife's portion

> May 22, 1376 (Westminster)Indenture of defeasance of the forgoing recognizance, upon condition that Elizabeth who was wife of Edward de Kendale knight if she be sole, shall when of age make out Alice Perrers within forty days when required a release of her right by reason of Dower in the manor of Hychene co. Hertford, or any other tenant thereof required, and shall be ready to enroll such release in the chancery or if she be couverte her husband and she shall by fine to be levied in the king's court before the justices of the Common Bench make a release of all her right therein by reason of her said dower.[237]

At some point in the year the entire manor passed to Alice.[238] For what reason the whole manor came under Alice's control is unclear but perhaps it was through her influence since there was a clause whereby Elizabeth would have to relinquish hold in front of the Common Bench - an institution which Alice has often been accused of influencing.[239]

---

[235]This was obviously an acquisition for the sake of her son from the beginning due to the speed with which it passed to him after she acquired it. Alice Perrers obtains the dower portion of the manor on 22 April 1376. At some point between this time and when the son is granted the reversion of the whole manor on 13 May 1377, she has gained control of the rest of the manor.

[236]Previous to this time, in October of 1375, the king had granted the manor in fee to, among others, William de Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, and William Latimer, to whom the land was handed over by the king's attorney, Robert Broun (CPR 1374-77, p. 188). At some point after this, it came into the hands of de Kendale, whom de Croyser seems to have bought out, though there is nothing in the primary documentation for the period to show how this occurred.

[237]CCR 1374-1377, p. 359. It is also notable that the previous owner, Elizabeth Kendale, was the granddaughter of the Warden of the Five Ports.

[238]CFR 1377-83, p. 103. This was perhaps as a result of the remarriage of the wife since Elizabeth de Kendale, "the king's widow" applied for a licence to marry on January 3, 1377. CPR 1374-77, p. 407.

[239]See Chapter Two

Alice then arranged for Hitchin to be assigned to her son after her own death.[240] That Alice was making such deals in 1376, and especially during the Good Parliament, shows that she was continuing to prepare for an uncertain future and trying to make provision for her son.[241]

Alice also used her influence with the king to get their son other manors. On 13 May 1377, John de Southam was granted

> the manor of Lowystoft by Yarmouth and the hundred of Luddynglond, co. Suffolk, with all liberties, commodities and profits pertaining thereto; and the reversions of the manors of Cosham, co. Wilts, and Salden which Ingram de Coucy, earl of Bedford, and Isabel his wife, hold for the life of the latter, the manor of Faxflete which John Stryvelyn, 'chivalier,' holds for life, the manor of Bolton by Carlisle which Robert Moubray, 'chivalier,' holds for life, all the lands held by John de Nowers, 'chivalier', for life, . . . and the manor of Walton on Trent which Godfrey Foljambe, 'chivalier,' deceased, held for a term still running.[242]

It is also notable in this respect that her son was deprived of some but not all of his lands in 1377.[243]

But, aside from her family, it was not in Alice's policy to give away land without a healthy return. Hence when she granted her wardship of manor of Frome Valeys to Robert Ashton, she was given limited term grants of land in the southwest as compensation.[244]

---

[240]CPR 1374-77, p. 462.

[241]Given-Wilson, Royal Bastards, p. 138. There is also evidence in the Inquisitions Miscellaneous that this large manor, in the neighborhood of 700 acres, was being used up until the forfeiture - for the farm, although the buildings themselves were of no great value, had a full range of implements for farming as well as a fair worth of crops owned by Alice in the buildings.CIM 1377-1388, pp. 11-12.

[242]CPR 1374-77, p. 462.

[243]Given-Wilson, Royal Bastards, p. 138.

[244]CIM 1377-88, pp. 2, 44. See next section.

Similarly, she leased the manor of Compton Mordak to William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester,[245] and sold him some land in Oxfordshire.[246] Thus Alice's generosity with her landed wealth was quite limited throughout her career.

II Loans

When it comes to loans in this period, however, Alice was considerably more forthcoming. The largest, and arguably the most interesting loan made by Alice in her early career is the one connected with the financing of the Rodeston transaction.[247] In this Alice is noted as having lent, at some time before November of 1365, the not inconsiderable sum of 1000 marks to the manor's owner, Anthony de Lucy.[248] That she was arranging such a high line of credit for others - even if it was not of her own funds in this early period - argues for a natural ease in the handling and accumulating of wealth.

She continues to lend to the gentry throughout the first phase in her career. By 20 November 1367, she has made another loan, this time of 600 pounds, to de Lucy for which he made to her a recognizance for that amount to be levied in Cumberland.[249] However, she is not above also making smaller loans in this period, such as one to John de Multon of Lincolnshire for the sum of 20 pounds.[250] Knowledge of her potential as a creditor, then, was becoming well known by 1367, at least among the gentry of the north, where, as it will

---

[245]See Chapter Three

[246]Tout, Chapters, 3:320-321.

[247]See Chapter Three.

[248]CCR 1364-68, p. 200.

[249]CCR 1364-68, p. 396.

[250]CCR 1364-68, p. 396.

be remembered, she had just gained the wardship of a block of lands.[251]

Similarly, it is not surprising that she was also known as a potential source of credit in London mercantile circles, considering her previous experience in that area as a royal representative. Hence, the other loan in this period was, in 1365 to a fishmonger named de Kent for the sum of 200 pounds.[252] That she was willing to take this man to court, however, is also evidence that she was not treating these advances as gifts but as loans which were supposed to be paid back. Even at this early stage, then, Alice can be considered not only shrewd when it came to money but also hard nosed when it came to the loss of it.

Alice continued to be more forthcoming with loans than with land grants throughout her career. On 25 June 1372, she is listed as having a recognizance from one Gilbert de Culwen, knight, for the sum of 500 pounds.[253] Similarly, in November of the same year, she has listed in the Close Rolls another recognizance, this time from Edward Foucher for the sum of 80 marks.[254] And on 12 December 1373, Lawrence de Pabenham, knight, is listed as owing her 100 pounds.[255] It was at some time in this period as well that she lent Lady Joan Mohun 100 pounds.[256] All these loans demonstrate her continuing policy of lending to either the country gentry or the mercantile class - two groups which she could have most easily identified and who would have been most open to her influence.

---

[251]See the discussion of the de Tilliol estates in Chapter Two.

[252]Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls: 1364-1381, p. 36.

[253]CCR 1369-74, p. 440.

[254]CCR 1369-74, p. 473.

[255]CCR 1369-74, p. 473.

[256]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 89.

This policy continued into the last phase of her career,[257] but by now Alice also seems to have made a blatant attempt to make more consequential friends by her loans. Robert Ashton, treasurer and later king's chamberlain, was given loans amounting to about 900 pounds[258] as well as the manor of Frome Valeys.[259] Though this was no doubt partly in exchange for a large land grant made by Ashton to Perrers[260], Perrers was obviously desperate to curry the favour of this powerful individual. After all, Ashton was the one who, in 1372, was sent to investigate her husband William de Windsor concerning certain abuses during his term as governor in Ireland.[261] It must therefore have taken a certain amount of incentive - perhaps the growing instability in the political situation - for Alice to have taken such an abrupt volte-face.

Similarly, by this time she was also giving credit to other erstwhile enemies. One, Richard Lyons, a London merchant and previously antagonistic towards her,[262] owed her 300 pounds. According to Holmes, moreover, this was a debt assigned to her by Gualterio Bardi of the Florentine merchant company of the same name who were obviously owed

---

[257]Loans in the last period include one to William Croper, knight, for 200 pounds, the recognizance for which was made on May 22, 1376(CCR 1374-1377, p. 359). As well, on June 19, 1376, there is an acquittance made to Alice Perrers for 55 pounds by Elizabeth, wife of Thomas de Fakenham, king's sergeant at arms, for a debt incurred by her husband during his life(CCR 1374-1377, p. 367). Finally, at the bottom end of the scale, Holmes also notes her as making a loan of 28 pounds to a London "frensshebakere" named William Gilmyn(Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 89).

[258]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 88.

[259]In December of the 1375,she granted her wardship of the manor of From Valeys to Ashton. CIM 1377-88, p. 2.

[260]See Chapter Three

[261]Though, as Harbison notes, his enthusiasm for prosecuting de Windsor seems to have waned as he realized from his investigations that de Windsor was only following the dictates of the royal government. Harbison, "William of Windsor," pp. 159-60.

[262]See Chapter Two

money by Lyons.[263] That Alice was also having dealings with international merchants such as the Bardis is fascinating and perhaps hints at further international connections as yet uncovered.[264]

Interestingly, another object of her credit activities was not an enemy of the distant past, but the object of a friend's present animosity. Indeed, William Latimer was one of the objects of her friend William of Wykeham's attacks on the court.[265] Despite this fact, however, Alice saw fit to lend Latimer a total of 80 pounds. According to Holmes this was divided into "40 pounds which she had given him 'to her use' and another 40 pounds which she had paid on his behalf for precious stones."[266] Though this is not an incredibly large sum in comparison to what she was lending to others, the rather specific terms of the loans seem to imply a certain amount of intimacy between Latimer and Perrers.

The last major loan in her career was also to a person of some prominence, namely Walter Fitz Walter, later one of the barons on the intercommuning committee of the 1377 Hilary parliament which reversed the judgements made by the Good Parliament.[267] Fitz Walter was captured in 1370 by the French and was forced in November of 1375 to mortgage the castle and manor of Egremont in Cumberland for 1000 pounds to Alice Perrers in order to

---

[263]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 88.

[264]If Braddy's statement about Alice controlling the customs for the port of London is correct, this may help explain her international connections. Braddy, "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers," p. 227.

[265]Anonimalle Chronicle, pp. 93-94.

[266]Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 88.

[267]Tout, Chapters, 3:115.

pay his ransom.[268]

Alice, then, had no problem in dealing with all sides of the political spectrum when it came to her financial activities. This was mainly because she had no powerful friends whom she was dependent upon for aid. But as a result of this independent stance, she had to try to secure her position piecemeal through separate acts of patronage to individuals whom she considered useful to her future well being.

III Influence

Perhaps one of the first indications that Alice's influence was going far beyond that of a normal king's mistress comes in this letter from Pope Gregory XI in 1371:

> To John Wykes, knight, king's councillor. Desiring him to urge the king, to whom the Pope is writing, to order John de Greli(Grailly), Captal de Buch, to set free Roger de Belloforti, the Pope's brother, who has been held in prison even from before the Pope's election. The Pope is sending Hugh, bishop of Clomacnoise, to whom full credence may be given.
>
> To Edward, prince of Aquitaine and Wales. Touching the same.
>
> To Aubrey Ver, secretary of the prince of Aquitaine and Wales. Touching the same.
>
> To William, bishop of Winchester, the king's councillor. Touching the same.
>
> To Richard, earl of Arundel. Touching the same.
>
> To Alice Pereres. Touching the same.
>
> To John Woderove, a friar preacher, master of theology. Touching the same.
>
> To Edmund Bokinham, a Benedictine. Touching the same.
>
> To Humphrey, earl of Hereford, marshal(constable) of England. Touching the same.

---

[268]Alice was later loath to give this castle up and after a lengthy court battle, the property later passed to William de Windsor's heir, John. CPR 1385-89, p. 205; CCR 1381-85, p. 505; CCR 1385-89, p. 309; see also Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 69; Given-Wilson, The English Nobility, p. 129. For other notes concerning Fitz Walter's attempts to mortgage Egremont, see CPR 1374-77, p. 191; CCR 1374-77, pp. 274-77.

To John, Duke of Lancaster. Touching the same.

To Edmund, earl of Cambridge. Touching the same.[269]

It is obvious, then, that by 1371 Alice was gaining at least some recognition in international circles as a woman of power within England.

When exactly Alice Perrers moved from the position of receiver to granter of patronage in her own country is difficult to say. But by the beginning of the 1370's people had definitely begun coming to her as a result of her growing acumen in the use of her position as king's mistress. One example of this is her aid given to the Earl of Stafford and his sons for the acquisition of the manor of Mulcote discussed in the previous chapter. However, there were other less important members of the landed class helped by Alice in this period. One was a knight named Thomas Fitzjohn. It seemed that Fitzjohn had a dispute with the abbot of St. Albans over the manor of Oxeeye Walround in Hertfordshire.[270] Fitzjohn decided to enter the manor of his own accord and was promptly ejected from the same manor by the abbot. About a year later, he renews his efforts concerning the manor, which he reenters on 9 July 1374 and on the same day enfeoffs to Alice Perers.[271] As one historian succinctly put it, this was the case of "an attempt by Fitzjohn to win the support of Alice Perrers"[272] and, according to Walsingham, no one dared to go against her.[273]

---

[269]Of the Entries in the Papal Registers, Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, vol. 4 (1362-1404). Prepared by W.H. Bliss and J.A. Twemlow (London: HMSO, 1902), pp. 96-97.

[270]Walsingham, for obvious reasons, talks about this case in some depth. See Chronica Monasterii S. Albani, pp. 227-234.

[271]It is unknown how Alice and Fitzjohn knew each other, but if the theory of her being connected with the Hertfordshire Perrers' has any validity, then there may well have been some form of connection between the two families. See Chapter One.

[272]Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 142.

[273]Walsingham, Chronica Monasterii S. Albani, p. 230.

But it was not just for the landed class that Alice used her influence. She also used her influence for the sake of her London friends. A complicated series of transactions concerning the lands and rents in the ward of Bradstreet in London, originally held by Walter de Chiryton will help to illustrate this point. In January of 1371, Alice is noted in an entry in the Patent Rolls as being part of a chain of enfeoffments from John de Wesenham to Adam Fraunceys and John Pyel, to Alice herself who in turn enfeoffed William de Greseleye, John Ploufeld, and John Vyncent who then enfeoffed Robert de Crull, John de Freton and Peter Tebaud. This list is of interest in itself to one studying Alice Perrers' career, for many of the men were either on the rise in the London business community,[274] such as Pyel and Fraunceys, or else they are the men who have and would continue to reappear as Alice's business associates throughout her career.

Moreover, in this transaction Alice was now openly interceding with the king on behalf of others:

> the king, at the prayer of the said Alice, has confirmed the said grants and feoffments, and grants that the last named feoffees may hold the premises quit as regards the king and his heirs of the portions due from the premises of all sums exacted or to be exacted from the king in the names of the said Walter and his fellows, John de Wesenham. . . .[275]

This transaction was obviously not for the sake of Alice because in the final group of enfeoffees there is only one who is a business associate of Alice, and not a very frequent

---

[274]For a discussion of the London business community in the 1370's see Ruth Bird, The Turbulent London of Richard II (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1949), pp. 1-16; Pamela Nightingale, "Capitalists, Crafts, and Constitutional Change in Late Fourteenth Century London," Past and Present 124 (August 1989):3-16.

[275]CPR 1370-74, p. 50.

one.[276] Thus, one might well be suspicious of Alice's existence in this enfeoffment chain in the first place. Considering the fact that between the time that Adam Fraunceys and John Pyel obtained hold of the land and when Crull, Freton and Tebaud gain final tenure, the land goes through a series of three changes in ownership in less than two years, one may well wonder if her presence in the chain was merely a way for her to validate the process though her influence with the king.

This use of influence by Alice during the middle phase of her career may be seen as an attempt to increase the power of her position in a general way. However, by the last two years of her career, she seems to have been definitely out to make friends in the court circle. Perhaps one of the most surprising reversals of policies in her career was the amiable way in which she treated Richard Lyons in the 1370's. Some say that some of her influence was due to a gift made by Lyons of a house in London.[277] Whatever the case, she got the king not only to pardon him for the crimes he was accused of in the Good Parliament and to be reinstated in his lands, but also to pardon Lyons for a debt of 300 pounds owed to the exchequer and more incredibly to get Lyons to make the king a gift of 1000 marks.[278]

The shoring up of her personal position in the last phase of her career can also be seen

---

[276] Furthermore, neither in the forfeiture proceedings in 1377, nor in de Windsor's petition in 1380, is this piece of property listed as being one of Alice Perrers' possessions. See CIM 1377-88, pp. 1-15; CPR 1377-81, p. 503.

[277] Howard, Chaucer, p. 204.

[278] Given-Wilson, The Royal Household, p. 143. For the activities which brought Lyons to the notice of the Good Parliament, see A. Saul, "Local Politics and the Good Parliament," in Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1984), pp. 157-59, 162-63, 166-67.

in the case of her husband, William de Windsor.[279] Indeed, her acts on his behalf, were a large part of the charges against her in 1376. De Windsor's chequered past was to cause a fair number of problems for Alice. In 1371, he was recalled from Ireland, where he had been governor since 1369. This, as Harbison notes, had little to do with Alice Perrers per se, but rather with the reforming parliament of 1371 and de Windsor's connection with Wykeham.[280] His reinstatement in 1374, however, probably had a great deal to do with Alice, as did his fall in 1376.[281]

Alice continued to help de Windsor until the end of her career. When Nicholas Dagworth was sent to Ireland as part of the commission to look into misadministration in 1375, she

---

[279] When they were married is a matter of great debate. When confronted with the accusation that Alice was a married woman by the Good Parliament, Edward said he had no knowledge of that fact (Walsingham, Chronicon Angliae, p. 97). It would seem then, that the marriage must have taken place at some point between November of 1375, when Alice was listed as single in a loan made to Walter Fitzwalter (Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 97), and April of 1376, when these accusations were made(Harbison agrees with this time frame.Harbison, "William of Windsor," p. 155). But there can be little doubt that some form of liaison existed between the two previous to this point. One has only to remember the 1374 grant made by the king to Windsor through the hands of Alice(Devon, Issues, p. 197)or even earlier, the possible connection existing between them as a result of her northern holdings in 1367, or even earlier yet, the fact that both of them were running in the same administrative circles in the mid 1360's.(In the same week in June of 1365 that Alice is in court in the City of London to retrieve some money owed to her, Windsor is also there as the king's deputy in another case. See Calendar of the Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London: 1364-1381, pp. 36-37).

[280]Harbison, "William of Windsor," p. 154. Richardson and Sayles, however, as well as Anthony Tuck, the most recent biographer of Richard II, see de Windsor's appointment as lieutenant in Ireland as mainly a result of his relationship with Alice. See H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, The Administration of Ireland: 1172-1377 (Dublin: Dublin Stationary Office, 1963), p. 13; Anthony Tuck, Richard II and the English Nobility (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1973), p. 22-23.

[281]Harbison, "William of Windsor," p. 154. However, M.V. Clarke's statement that "any movement against the Irish administration was a direct challenge to her(Perrers')influence" may be somewhat overstated. After all, Windsor and others had been deposed before, simply for maladministration, and bad administration seems to have plagued Ireland throughout the latter part of the fourteenth century. See Maude Violet Clarke, "William of Windsor in Ireland, 1369-76," in Fourteenth Century Studies, eds. L.S. Sutherland and M. McKisack (New York: Books for Libraries Press Inc., 1967), p. 148.

made efforts to have him recalled. She saw Dagworth as biased against de Windsor and, according to the evidence given in the parliament of 1377, petitioned the king privately for Dagworth's dismissal from the commission.[282]

Finally, there is the case of William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester. Being of diminished political power after his fall in 1371, Wykeham seems to have begun associating with Alice as her grant to him of a lease of the manor of Compton Mordak shows. Again, it is notable that though he is one of the critics of the court circle during the Good Parliament of 1376, he makes no mention of Alice in his criticisms but rather saves his energy for William Latimer.[283] Moreover, it was Alice who seems to have got him reinstated after he is deprived of his office and his temporalities by the actions of Gaunt in early 1377.[284]

All this is perhaps evidence that within the court circle Alice had found herself far too isolated and was trying to rectify the situation in the last years of Edward's life. She had spent most of her energy in creating a reliable network of supporters in order to aid her in her business transactions. Unfortunately for Alice, these were rarely men of power. Moreover, as the health of king was becoming increasingly unstable, she had to find other men of influence to protect her status. Though it is evident that Alice Perrers failed in this respect in 1377, in the long term she may have chosen some of the right people because she,

---

[282]RP, 3:13. Indeed, it was not for misadministration in Ireland that de Windsor was imprisoned later in 1376, but because of a quarrel between him and others at a Carmelite house in London. Holmes, The Good Parliament, p. 158.

[283]Anonimalle Chronicle, pp. 93-94.

[284]Though, as Packe notes, her influence may have been gained at a price. Packe, King Edward III, p. 299. It seems that William de Windsor, and therefore Alice Perrers, stayed friendly to Wykeham even after Edward's death, for de Windsor granted him the manor of Meon Stoke, Hampshire, soon after he had successfully petitioned the king to get Alice's lands back in 1380. See CPR 1377-81, p. 503.

in her husband's name, managed to get the majority of her lands back in 1380.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary/Conclusions

I Summary

i) Land

The evidence presented in the last three chapters is by no means a complete catalogue of Alice Perrers' financial dealings since there are occasional signs that Alice was involved in other deals.[285] The recorded transactions, however, are probably the important ones made by Alice Perrers and certainly representative of her land acquisition policy as well as the patronage policy of the king. In total, Alice obtained hold of 57 manors throughout her career in addition to various tenements and smaller parcels of land. Of these 57 manors, only 14 were given to her by royal grant whereas she obtained 42 by her own means.[286] Moreover, of the king's grants, only 3 were given to her in fee, while the other 11 were given in wardships.

In contrast, of the 42 manors acquired by Alice Perrers of her own initiative, 13 were held in fee, 12 were life or limited grants, 6 were held by leasehold and 11 were held in a single wardship which had at least twelve years left on it. Of the ones held in fee, all of them save one were in prime locations - that is, in the counties directly touching on London. Though her life grants were more widespread, seven of them, the Ashton grants in the southwest, were in a parcel, while the rest were again focused in the area surrounding London.

---

[285]See Appendix Three.

[286]One manor, the manor of Bixe in Oxfordshire, is of unknown origin.

Alice clearly had an estate policy. Residence manors were close by manors supplying provisions. For example, the residence manor of Pallingswyk appears to have been supplied by the manors of Gunnersbury and Bourne Hall and the castle of Moor End in Northamptonshire by the manors of Moor End and Colworth.[287] Most of the estate was geared to producing income, however, since she had only 3 manors which could be termed permanent residences[288] and at best 6 manors to supply them. The other 48 manors supplied rental income and were generally more outlying than her residence and supply manors, thus fitting into a well known pattern of estate management practiced by many of the great land institutions of the time.[289]

This taste for economically profitable manors made the annual income of her total holdings high. In terms of actual worth of her estate at time of forfeiture, the estate as a whole was worth 481. 16s. 5d. per annum. However, this is with only 26 of the 53 manors[290] held in 1377 being given any form of evaluation and this is not including the sundry smaller parcels of land. If, however, we use this percentage to project a number for the whole of the manorial estate, we get a projected total of roughly 900 pounds per year for income.

---

[287] The decision as to which were income manors and which were for the supply of food has been taken from the inventories taken at the time of forfeiture. See CIM 1377-88, pp. 1-15.

[288] The other permanent residence manor was Wendover in Buckinghamshire, which had no supply manor in its own county and therefore was probably supplied by manors in neighboring counties of Berkshire and Middlesex.

[289] For examples of the use of this estate policy, see R.A.L. Smith, Canterbury Cathedral Priory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), pp. 132-33; E. Miller, The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 51.

[290] Four manors were sold off or given away in the course of her career. See Appendix Two

Of the recorded number, the manors which Alice gained from her own transactions account for 436. 6s. 5d. of her annual manorial income.[291] Regrettably, we only have worths of 2 of the 14 manors obtained by royal patronage, which produce a net value of 45. 10s. On the basis of the 1377 values, we find that Alice's own acquisitions make up for well over 80 percent of her total estate.

In protecting her land gains, Alice had a determined taste for land acquisition over all other forms of economic activity. It is no surprise, then, that of all the manors which could be enfeoffed to others to her use, all but one were enfeoffed.[292] Moreover, since these were her most reliable and permanent form of income, it was rare that she gave any up. Only in extreme circumstances, or for a definite profit, would she give away a parcel of land.

ii) Loans

Rather, any patronage which she might give out was to take the form of credit arrangements. Though less stable as a form of investment, loans were an easy and fast way of turning a profit. In her career, she lent out at least 5200 pounds to various individuals, though there is no doubt much more that is simply not recorded. If one breaks this down into the three phases used throughout this thesis, in her first phase she lent out 1820 pounds in the second phase 780 pounds, and in the third phase 2600 pounds. If one relates this first to her rate of land acquisition, one realizes that when her credit rose at the beginning and end of her career, her land acquisition declined, and when it was low in her second phase her land acquisition was high. This appears to help reinforce the theory that Alice was

---

[291]This accounts for 23 of her 42 independently acquired estates.

[292]Namely, the manor of Bramfordspeke in Devon which was obtained toward the end of her career.

definitely working from a limited fund of money.

Moreover, the status of those to whom she was lending definitely dependent upon how confident she was in her career. Consequently, while her position with respect to the king was fairly stable, she was self assured enough to lend money to any one regardless of their status provided they would pay the interest. However, when the political crisis started to deepen in 1375, her loans become far more political. She tended to lend more to individuals who had the potential to affect her fate. She seems, then, to have made a conscious attempt to shore up a position that previously had been based on very narrow base.

iii) Influence

Indeed, this narrow base was founded on her relationship to the king and her relationship to a group of men, most of whom had limited power, but were useful as her supporters. Thus, up until the mid 1370's, the only form of influence which she had came from the king and these men.

However, as with her loans, in the later 1370's she seems to have made a concerted effort to befriend men of power often to the exclusion of her earlier supporters. Hence while in her early and mid period she had been content with simply accumulating wealth by whatever method seemed most profitable, in the last years of her career, she began to realize that this was not enough. By her prominence in the court, she had set herself up for attacks from critics. Therefore, it was imperative that she made alliances with at least some men in power. That she attempted to do this is obvious by her credit activities. Unfortunately for Alice, the fact that she could not forge strong alliances fast enough was paramount to her undoing.

II Conclusions

It is evident, then, that not only did Alice have the ability to survive over twelve years in a position which most people saw as temporary, but she was also able to gain a very impressive amount of wealth as a king's mistress. However, it is also more than obvious that this was by no means solely the result of the king's patronage. For, though perhaps some of the original financial impetus for her acquisitions in the mid 1360's came from the king, she managed even these early transactions in a way which was all her own. Later, as her income from these manors as well as various other transactions accrued, she obviously had little problem in arranging all aspects of her dealings herself. Moreover, as for the king being overly generous to his mistress of his own accord, in terms of the most lucrative of gifts open to him, land grants, he seems to have had a set policy and stuck to it. From the beginning of his relationship with her he made her only six grants encompassing fourteen manors.

But, if Edward had a policy, so did Alice. Not only did she seem to have a set purchasing policy - buying mainly income producing manors rather than residential ones - but she also knew how to keep them in her hands. Moreover, with her business transactions in general, she seems to have been a good judge of character about whom she could and could not trust.

Thus in the financial aspects of her career itself, she did very well and proved herself to be a more than competent business woman. Ironically, considering that it was personal preference which first got her in as king's mistress, it was in her handling of the political side of her career where in the end she failed. Her neglect of the necessity to make friends until it was too late threatened to undo all her work.[293]

---

[293]Though, as has been noted, she ceased to receive royal preferential treatment after 1377, she did get the majority of her lands back through the actions of her husband, William de Windsor. See CPR 1377-81, pp. 503-04.

But her failure in this respect does not account for her notoriety in the historiography of the period. Even if she had been successful and had not been attacked by the Good Parliament, her success, especially as a woman of obscure birth, could not but have caused envy. In fact, it is a line from a chronicler that gives us a clue as to the infamy of her reputation. Walsingham once stated of her that she held herself surpassing the ways of women.[294] Herein lay perhaps the problem for many contemporaries. For not only was she clearly ambitious, she also rose above her designated role and acted an independent entity. Indeed if any one line can sum up the purpose of this thesis, it is to study how an individual can enhance power through the intelligent use of status. In the present society this might be considered an admirable ability, but for a society rigidly defined by the importance of the concept of role, it is little wonder that Alice has received the type of press which she has.

---

[294]Walsingham, Ypodigma Neustriae, p. 322.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

The Anonimalle Chronicle: 1333-1381. Edited by V.H. Galbraith. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970.

Calendar of Letter-Books Preservd Among the Archives of the Cty of London at the Guildhall: Letter-Book H Circa A.D.1375-1399. Edited by Reginald R. Sharpe. London: John Edward Francis, 1907.

Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London:a.d. 1364-1381. Edited by A.H. Thomas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.

Capgrave, John. Chronicle of England. Edited by Francis Hungerston. Rolls Series 1. London: Longmans, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts 1858.

The Cartulary of Holy Trinity Aldgate. Edited by Gerald A.J. Hodgett. London: London Record Society, 1971.

A Collection of All the Wills of the Kings and Queens of England. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969.

Collections for a History of Staffordshire. Edited by The William Salt Archaeological Society, Vol. 13: 1892. London: Harrison and Sons, 1892.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Charter Rolls. 6 vols(1227-1516). London: HMSO, 1903-1927. (CCharR)

Great Britain. Public Recor Office. Calenar of Close Rolls: Edward III. 14 vols(1327-1377). London: HMSO, 1896-1913. (CCR)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Fine Rolls. 22 vols(1272-1509). London: HMSO, 1911-1962. (CFR)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous. 6 vols(1219-1399). London: HMSO, 1916-1963. (CIM)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem. 14 vols(1244-1377). London: HMSO, 1904-1952.(CIPM)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Patent Rolls: Edward III. 16 vols(1327-1377). London: HMSO, 1893-1916.(CPR)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Records Office. 6 vols. London: HMSO, 1900-1915. (AD)

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Inquisitions and Assessments Relating to Feudal Aids: With Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record A.D.1284-1431. 6 vols(1284-1431). London: HMSO, 1899-1920. (FA)

Higden, Ranulph, Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis. Edited by Joseph Lumby. Rolls Series 41:8. Weisbaden: Kraus Reprint, 1964.

Issues of the Exchequer. Edited by Frederick Devon. London: John Murray, 1837.

Langland, William. Piers the Ploughman. Translated by J.F. Goodridge. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968.

Langland, William. The Vision of Piers Plowman. Edited by A.V.C. Schmidt. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1978.

Life Records of Chaucer. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1900.

Of the Entries in the Papal Registers, Relating to Grat Britain and Ireland Vol. 4 (1362-1404). Prepared by W.H. Bliss and J.A. Twemlow. London: HMSO, 1902.

Rotuli Parliamentorum. Edited by J. Strachey et al. 6 vols (1767-77).(RP)

Seldon Society: Select Cases Before the King's Council: 1243-1482. Edited by I.S. Leadam and J.F. Baldwin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Walsingham, Thomas. Chronicon Anglie, ab Anno Domini 1328 ad Annum 1388. Edited by E. M. Thompson. Rolls Series 64. Weisbaden: Kraus Reprint, 1965.

Walsingham, Thomas. Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani. Edited by Henry Thomas Riley. Rolls Series 28:4 Vol. 3. Weisbaden: Kraus Reprint, 1965.

Walsingham, Thomas. Ypodigma Neustriae a Thomas Walsingham, Quondam Monacho Monasterii S. Albani, Conscriptum. Edited by Henry Thomas Riley. Rolls Series 28:7. Weisbaden: Kraus Reprint, 1965.

Warwickshire Feet of Fines. Edited by Lucy Drucker. Vol. 3 (1345-1509) London: Dugdale Society, 1943.

Secondary Sources

Armitage-Smith, Sydney. John of Gaunt. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1904.

Barnes, Joshua. The History of That Most Victorious Monarch Edward III. Cambridge: John Hayes, 1688.

Bayley, C.C. "The Campaign of 1375 and the Good Parliament." English Historical Review 55 (1940):370-83.

Bean, J.M.W. From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.

Bennett, H.S. Life on an English Manor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

Bird, Ruth. The Turbulent London of Richard II London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1949.

Braddy, Haldeen. "Chaucer and Dame Alice Perrers." Speculum 21 (1946):222-28.

Braddy, Haldeen. "Chaucer, Dame Alice Perrers, and Cecily Chaumpaigne." Speculum 52 (1977):906-11.

Butt, Ronald. A History of Parliamenty: The Middle Ages. London: Constable and Company, 1989.

Cammidge, John. The Black Prince. London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1943.

Clarke, Maude Violet. Fourteenth Century Studies. Edited by Sutherland and M. McKisack. New York: Books for Libraries Press Inc., 1967.

Cokayne, G.E. The Complete Peerage. 13 vols. London: The Catherine Street Press, 1910-1959.

Dictionary of Na tional Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sydney Lee. 22 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1908-1909. (DNB)

Elton, G.R. England:1200-1640. London: The Sources of History Limited, 1969.

Galbraith, V.H. "Thomas Walsingham and the St. Albans' Chronicle." English Historical Review 47 (1932):12-29.

Galway, Margaret. "Alice Perrers's Son John." English Historical Review 66 (1951):242-246.

Gambier-Parry, T.R. "Alice Perrers and her Husband's Relatives." English Historical Review 47:186 (April 1932):272-76.

Given-Wilson, Chris. The English Nobility in the Later Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century Political Community. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.

Given-Wilson, Chris. "The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households, 1360-69." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 51:123 (May 1978):183-87.

Given-Wilson, Chris. The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Given-Wilson, Chris and Curteis, Alice. The Royal Bastards of Mediaeval England. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Goodman, Anthony A History of England From Edward II to James I London: Longman Group Ltd., 1977.

Goodman, Anthony. "John of Gaunt." England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium. Edited by W.M. Ormrod. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1986.

Goodman, Anthony. "John of Gaunt: Paradigm of the Late Fourteenth Century Crisis." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Ser. 5:37 (1987):133-148.

Grandsen, Antonia. Historical Writing in England. Vol. 1:c.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Hansen, Harriet. "The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 and the Chronicles." Journal of Medieval History. 6:4 (December 1980):393-415.

Harbison, S. "William of Windsor, the Court Party and the Administration of Ireland."England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages. Edited by James Lydon. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981.

Hardy, B.C. Philippa of Hainault and her Times. London: John Long Ltd., 1910.

Holmes, George. The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth Century England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Holmes, George. The Good Parliament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Howard, Donald R. Chaucer: His Life, His Works, His World. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1987.

Huppe, Bernard "The A-Text of Piers Plowman and the Norman Wars," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 44 (March 1939):37-64.

Hutchison, Harold. The Hollow Crown: A Life Of Richard II. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode,1961.

Jewell, Helen. "Piers Plowman: A Poem of Crisis: An Analysis of Political Instability in Langland's England." Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth Century England. Edited by John Taylor and Wendy Childs. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1990.

Kay, F. George. Lady of the Sun: The Life and Times of Alice Perrers. London: Frederick Muller Ltd., 1966.

Keen, Maurice. English Society in the Later Middle Ages: 1348-1500. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1990.

MacKinnon, James. The History of Edward III: 1327-1377. Ipswich: The Boydell Press, 1900.

McFarlane, K.B. The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and

Related Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

McKisack, May "Edward III and the Historians," History 45 (1960):1-15.

McKisack, May. The Fourteenth Century: 1307-1399. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

E. Miller, The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

Myers, A.R. London in the Age of Chaucer Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.

Myers, A.R."The Wealth of Richard Lyons." Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson. Edited by T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Nightingale, Pamela. "Capitalists, Crafts, and Constitutional Change in Late Fourteenth Century London." Past and Present 124 (August 1989):3-35.

Notes and Queries 7th Ser. VII 8 June 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 13 July 1889; 7th Ser. VIII 3 August 1889; 9th Ser. II 17 September 1896.

Owst, G.R. Literature and the Pulpit in Medieval England: A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters and of the English People. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Packe, Michael. King Edward III. Edited by L.C.B. Seaman. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.

Plucknett, T.F.T. "The Impeachments of 1376." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Ser.5:1 (1951):153-64.

Plucknett, T.F.T. "The Origin of Impeachment." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society Ser.5:1 (1942):47-71.

Prestwich, Michael. The Three Edwards: War and State in England 1272-1377. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980.

Ramsay, James H. Genesis of Lancaster: 1307-1399. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Richardson, H.G.and Sayles, G.O. The Administration of Ireland: 1172-1377. Dublin: Dublin Stationary Office, 1963.

Saul, A. "Local Politics and the Good Parliament."Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History. Edited by Tony Pollard. Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1984.

Smith, R.A.L. Canterbury Cathederal Priory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.

Steel, Anthony. The Receipt of the Exchequer: 1377-1485. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Taylor, John. English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century. Oxford: Clardendon Press, 1987.

Taylor, John. "The Good Parliament and Its Sources." Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth Century England. Editd by John Taylor and Wendy Childs. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1990.

Times Literary Supplement 3 July 1919; 17 July 1919; 31 July 1919; 7 August 1919; 14 August 1919; 21 August 1919; 28 August 1919; 4 Sept 1919.

Thomson, John A.F. The Transformation of Medieval England: 1370-1529. London: Longman Group Limited, 1983.

Tout, Thomas Frederick. Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England. 6 vols. Manchester: University Press, 1920-33.

Trevelyan, G.M. England in the Age of Wycliffe. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.

Tuck, Anthony. Richard II and the English Nobility. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1973.

A Victoria History for the County of Buckinghamshire. 4 vols. London: Dawsons Press, 1969.

A Victoria History for the County of Warwickshire. 8 vols. London: Dawsons Press, 1965-1969.

Wedgewood, J.C. "John of Gaunt and the Packing of Parliament," English Historical Review 45 (1930):623-625.

Manorial Holdings 1365-1377
Northumberland
·38
·8
·7
·9
Cumberland
·10
Durham
Westmorland
·36
Yorkshire
·23
Lancashire
Cheshire
Derbyshire
·39
Lincolnshire
·24
·25
Notts
Staffs
·43
·42
Salop
Leics
Rut
Norfolk
·29
·30
·49
·48
·31
Hunts
·6
Worcs
Warwick
Northants
·34
·35
·90
·32
·33
·37
·36
Cambs
Suffolk
·47
Hereford
·40
Gloucester
Oxford
Bucks
·22
Essex
·14
·15
·19
Herts
·21
·16
·17
·1
·2
·26
·27
·18
·3
·4
·41
·5
Middx
·28
Berkshire
Wiltshire
·53
·54
·55
·51
·52
Surrey
Kent
·44
Somerset
·45
·46
Hampshire
·11
Devon
·20
Dorset
·13
·12

APPENDIX ONE

Geographical Distribution of Land Holdings

Berkshire

1.Ardington
2.Drayton
3.Fylbertcourt(Hanneye)
4.Wantage

Buckinghamshire

5.Wendover

Cambridgeshire

6.Iselham

Cumberland

7.Kirklinton
8.Scaleby
9.Rickerby
10.Solport

Devon

11.Bramfordspeke

Dorset

12.Litton
13.Poorstock

Essex

14.Bradwell
15.Danseye
16.Hokkele
17.Pilton
18.Upminster(Gaynes)
19.West Newlands

Hampshire

20.Meon Stoke

Hertfordshire

21.Bourne Hall
22.Hitchin

Lancashire
23.Houghton

Lincolnshire

24.Hamby
25.Candelsby

Middlesex

26.Pallyngswyk
27.Gunnersbury
28.Southcote

Norfolk

29.Buckenham
30.Tibenham

Northamptonshire

31.Colworth
32.Farndon
33.Lillington Dansey
34.Moorend(Castle and Manor)
35.Plumpton Pirye(Plumpton Halle)
36.Morton
37.Rodeston

Northumberland
38.Monylaws

Nottinghamshire

39.Fyllyngley

Oxfordshire

40.Bixe
41.Kingham

Shropshire

42.Bentham(Benthall)
43.Whittington(castle on border with Wales)

Somerset

44.Freme Valeys

45.Knowle
46.Luddeford

Suffolk

47.Cratfeld

Warwickshire

48.Compton Mordak
49.Mulcote
50.Weston

Wiltshire

51.Crofton
52.Stanton
53.Unnamed Manor in Fennysutton
54.Unnamed Manor in Fennysutton
55.Unnamed Manor in Fennysutton

Yorkshire

56.Hunmanby

APPENDIX TWO

Table of Manorial Acquisitions

I Royal Grants To Alice Perrers

Year	Manor	County	Tenure	Net Annual Value(1377)
1367	Kirklinton (1/3 manor)	Cumb	wardship	
1367	Houghton	Cumb	wardship	
1367	Scaleby (Castle and Park)	Cumb	wardship	
1367	Rickerby	Cumb	wardship	
1367	Solport	Cumb	wardship	
1368	Monylaws	Northumb	in fee[295]	
1374	Wantage	Berks	wardship	40 10 0
1374	Bentham	Salop	wardship	
1374	Whittington	Salop	wardship	5 5 0
1374	Stanton	Wilts	wardship	
1374	Crofton	Wilts	wardship	
1375	Freme Valeys	Somerset	wardship[296]	
1375	Bramfordspeke	Devon	in fee	

[295]Held from 30 July 1368 to 16 July 1369.

[296]Alice granted this manor to Robert Ashton on 10 August 1375.

No Date Given

1372? Fylbercourt (Hanneye)	Berks	in fee	

II Independent Manorial Acquisitions by Alice Perrers

Year	Manor	County	Tenure	Net Annual Value(1377)
1365	Radston	Northants	life	21 15 8
1368	Ardington	Berks	in fee	48 10 0
1368	Meon Stoke	Hants	in fee	
1369	Mulcote[297] (1/4 manor)	Warwick	in fee	
1370	Iselham	Cambs	wardship	40 0 0
1370	Bradwell	Essex	wardship	22 18 6
1370	Danseye	Essex	wardship	23 6 4
1370	Hokkele	Essex	wardship	
1370	Pilton	Essex	wardship	
1370	Hamby	Lincs	wardship	50 0 0
1370	Candelsby	Lincs	wardship	
1370	Buckenham	Norfolk	wardship	20 0 0
1370	Tebinham	Norfolk	wardship	16 13 4
1370	Cratfield	Suffolk	wardship	20 0 0
1370	Hunmanby (1/3 manor)	Yorks	wardship	
1370	Compton Mordak	Warwick	in fee	
1371	Wendover	Bucks	in fee	80 0 0

[297]Sold to the Staffords at some point before the forfeiture proceedings in 1377.

1373	Drayton	Berks	rent	8 12 4
1373	Upminster (Gaynes)	Essex	in fee	
1373	West Newlands (2/3 manor)	Essex	in fee	3 10 4
1373	Bourne Hall	Herts	in fee	1 18 2
1373	Pallyngswyk	Midsex	rent	1 18 1
1373	Gunnersbury	Midsex	rent	3 6 4
1373	Weston	Warwick	in fee	16 0 0
1374	Colworth	Northants	in fee	8 11 8
1374	Fyllyngley	Notts	rent	
1374	Earndon	Northants	in fee	
1375	Southcote (moiety)	Midsex	rent	2 11 11
1375	Poorstock	Dorset	limited term (while sole)	
1375	Litton	Dorset	limited term (while sole)	
1375	Knowle	Somerset	limited term (while sole)	
1375	Luddeford	Somerset	limited term (while sole)	
1375	unnamed manor in Sutton Veney	Wilts	limited term (while sole)	
1375	unnamed manor in Sutton Veney	Wilts	limited term (while sole)	
1375	unnamed manor in Sutton Veney	Wilts	limited term (while sole)	
1375	Stoke Mandeville (moiety)	Bucks	in fee	
1376	Morton	Northants	lease	6 13 4

1376 Hitchin[298]	Herts	for life	23 7 7
1377 Moorend (Castle and Manor)	Northants	for life	6 13 4
1377 Lillington Dansey (Parcel with of of Moorend)	Northants	for life	4 17 0

No Date Given

1374? Kingham	Oxford	in fee	10 0 0
1376? Plumpton Pirye	Northants	for life	5 6 4

No Date Given and Unknown Origin

- Bixe	Oxford	for life	

[298]Hitchin passes to her son in May of 1377. See Chapter Four.

APPENDIX THREE

Index of Citations of Properties

i)Manors and Connected Properties

Ardington(Berkshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 79; CIM 1377-88, pp. 3-5, 31; CPR 1367-1370, pp. 125, 147; CPR 1370-74, p. 198; CPR 1385-89, p. 494).

Bentham(Shropshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, pp. 85, 327).

Bixe(Oxfordshire)- manor(CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Buckenham(Norfolk)- manor(CIM 1377-88, p. 2).

Bourne Hall(Hertfordshire)- manor and two tenements called Harpusbourne and Marleputtes, a tenement called Latymeres, a tenement called Halles, and a carucate of land called Totenhalle (CFR 1377-83, p. 44, 60; CIM 1377-88, p. 11; CPR 1377-81, p. 314, 503, 504).

Bradwell(Essex)- manor (CIM 1377-88, p. 10).

Bramfordspeke(Devon) - manor and the advowson of the church of Wemmeworth (CPR 1374-77, p. 205).

Candelsby(Lincolnshire)- manor(CIM 1377-88, p.3)

Colworth(Northamptonshire)- manor and a messuage in Northampton (CFR 1377-83, pp. 51, 181; CIM 1377-88, pp. 8-9; CPR 1377-81, pp. 503(also mentions 3 carucates of land, 40 acres of meadow, 60s rent and the advowson of a chapel), 519).

Compton Mordak(Warwickshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 65; CIM 1377-88, pp. 3,9; CPR 1377-81, p. 420, 423, 503; CCR 1381-85, p. 105).

Cratfield(Suffolk)- manor (CIM 1377-88, p. 1).

Danseye(Essex)- manor(parcel with the manor of Bradewell) (CIM 1377-88, p. 10).

Drayton(Berkshire)- also known as 'Elesfeld'(CIM 1377-88, pp. 4-5, 11, 45, 59; CPR 1377-81, pp. 468, 503; CCR 1377-81, p. 315; CCR 1381-85, p. 105).

Farndon(Northamptonshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 65; CIM 1377-88, p. 9; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Sutton Veney(Wiltshire)- reversion of three manors in Sutton Veney(CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CPR 1381-85, p. 386).

Freme Valeys(Somerset)- manor also known as 'Frome and Valeys' or 'Frome Braunche' (CIPM 1374-77, p. 330; CIM 1377-88, pp.2, 44; CPR 1377-81, p 167, 310).

Fylbercourt(Berkshire)- manor in Esthanneye (CFR 1377-83, pp. 81, 97; CIM 1387-93, p. 191; CPR 1370-74, p. 198; CPR 1377-81, pp. 324, 503, 504; CPR 1385-89, pp. 159, 494).

Fyllyngley(Nottinghamshire)- manor(CIM 1377-88, pp. 2-3; CPR 1374-77, p. 153).

Gunnersbury(Middlesex)- manor and a messuage and 2 acres of land at Brentford (CFR 1377-83, p. 73, 169; CIM 1377-88, pp. 12-13; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Hamby(Lincolnshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, pp. 85, 111; CIM 1377-88, p. 3).

Hokkele(Essex)- manor(parcel with the manor of Bradewell)(CIM 1377-88, p. 10).

Hitchin(Hertfordshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 103; CIM 1377-88, pp. 11-12; CPR 1377-81, p. 504; CCR 1374-77, p. 359).

Iselham(Cambridgeshire)- manor (CIM 1377-88, p. 2).

Knowle(Somerset)- reversion of the manor (CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CPR 1381-85, p. 386; CCR 1381-85, p. 376).

Kingham(Oxfordshire)- manor also known as 'Chastelyns' (CFR 1377-83, p. 95; CIM 1377-88, p. 5; AD Vol. 3, pp. 452-3; CPR 1377-81, p. 205, 503; CCR 1381-85, p. 105).

Lillyngston Dansey(Northamptonshire)- manor (CIM 1377-88, p. 6).

Luddeford(Somerset)- reversion of the manor (CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CPR 1381-85, p. 386; CCR 1381-85, p. 386; CCR 1381-85, p. 376.

Litton(Dorset)- reversion of the manor (CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CPR 1381-85, p. 386; CCR 1381-85, p. 354).

Monylaws(Northumberland)- manor (CPR 1367-70, p. 146, 292).

Meon Stoke(Hampshire)- manor (CPR 1370-74, p. 198; CCR 1381-85, p. 101).

Moorend(Northamptonshire)- castle with manor (CIM 1377-88, pp. 7, 9; CPR 1374-77, p. 477; CPR 1377-81, p. 250).

Morton(Northamptonshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 63; CIM 1377-88, pp. 8-9, CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Mulcote(Warwickshire)- manor(held with three others)(CIM 1372-1377, p. 318; CPR 1370-74, p. 301).

Pallyngeswyk(Middlesex)- manor and the plots of Northebrok and Gormyngesbery (CFR 1377-83, p. 50, 73; CIM 1377-88, p. 12; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Pilton(Essex)- manor(parcel with the manor of Bradwell(CIM 1377-88, p. 10).

Plumpton Perye(Northamptonshire)- manor also called 'Plumpton Halle' (CFR 1377-83, p. 72; CIM 1377-88, pp. 7, 9).

Poorstock(Dorset)- reversion of the manor (CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CPR 1381-85, p. 386; CCR 1381-85, p. 354).

Radston(Northamptonshire)- manor (CFR 1377-1383, pp. 51, 69, 83; CIM 1377-88, p. 8; CPR 1377-81, pp. 503, 519; CCR 1364-68, p. 200).

Southcote(Middlesex)- moiety of the manor and other appurtenances in the couny of Buckinghamshire (CFR 1377-83, p. 74; CIM 1377-88, p. 12; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Stanton(Wiltshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 69).

Stoke Maundevil(Buckinghamshire)- moiety of a manor (CFR 1377-83, pp. 86-7; CIM 1377-88, p. 1; CPR 1377-81, pp. 226(bis), 503).

Tebinham(Norfolk)- manor (CIM 1377-88, p. 1).

Upminster(Essex)- manor also known as 'Gaynes' (CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CCR 1405-09, p. 39).

Wantage(Berkshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 69).

Wendover(Buckinghamshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, pp. 65, 137; CIM 1377-88, pp. 1, 73; CPR 1370-74, pp. 161, 198; CPR 1377-81, pp. 285; CCR 1377-81, p. 50; Seldon Society: Select Cases 1243-1482 p. lxxxiii).

West Newlands(Essex)- two thirds of a manor (CFR 1377-83, p. 78; CIM 1377-88, p. 10; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Weston(Warwickshire)- manor (CFR 1377-83, pp. 66, 75; CIM 1377-88, p. 3; CPR 1377-81, p. 504; CCR 1385-89, p. 78).

Whittington(Shropshire)- castle (CFR 1377-83, pp. 85, 110; CIM 1377-88, p. 23).

ii)Properties Unconnected with a Manor

All Hallows(London) messuage and a shop in the parish of All Hallows the Less in Dowgate ward (CFR 1377-83, p. 167; CIM 1377-88, pp. 13-17; CPR 1370-74, p. 229; CPR 1377-81, pp. 376, 504(bis); CPR 1381-85, p. 60; CCR 1377-81, p. 160; CCR 1399-1402, p. 160; Calendar of Select Pleas 1381-1412, p. 167).

All the lands late of John de Oreby, and the hundred of Shropham and rent issuing from 'Le Tolleboth' of Bishops Lynn, except the lands in the counties of Chester and Derby and the manor of Westwotton in Yorkshire (CFR 1377-83, pp. 94-95, 137; CIM 1377-88, p. 2).

Battushyn(Oxfordshire)- "tenement in the town of Oxford; a shop now held by Stephen Wynard; a shop now held by John Scherman; a shop now held by Richard le Mersche, a

tenement called Cherltonhyn; a tenement now held by John le Spencere; a tenement now held by John Manciple; a tenement now held by Thomae Dyer; a tenement now held by William Dyer; a tenement now held by Thomas le Sclattere"(CIM 1377-88, p. 5).

Bermundeseye- tenement in Suthwerk, late of William Forster, citizen of London(CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Bushey and Bekeswell(Hertfordshire)- one knight's fee (CIPM 1370-73, p. 143; CIM 1377-88, p. 10; FA 1284-1431, p. 584; CCR 1377-81, pp. 391-92; CCR 1392-96, p. 506(and Watford); CCR 1399-1402, pp. 161-62; CCR 1402-05, pp. 227-28).

Bradstreet(London) - a tenement in the ward of Bradstreet (CPR 1370-74, pp. 49-50).

Burghwell(Cambridgeshire)- lands, rents, and services in Burghwell(CPR 1377-81, p. 503)

Bourne Hall(Hertfordshire)- a tenement called Bourne Hall as well as ones called Harpusburne, Marlepettes, Latimers, and Halles in the town of Bissheye (CIM 1377-88, pp. 10-11; CPR 1377-81,p. 313).

Burton Noveray(Leicestershire)- 4 pounds of rent (CFR 1377-83, p. 99; CIM 1377-88, pp. 3, 48; CPR 1377-81, pp. 503(lands, rents, and services with bond tenants), 504; CCR 1377-81, pp. 295-96, 456-57; CCR 1385-89, p. 48).

Charleston Inn(Oxfordshire)- inn in the university of Oxford (CFR 1377-83, pp. 135, 193).

Crofton(Wiltshire)- certain lands in Crofton late of Fulk Fitz Waryn (CFR 1377-83, p . 86; CCR 1377-81, p. 273).

Edlyngton(Yorkshire)- all lands in Edlyngton late of Fulk Fitz Waryn (CFR 1377-83, p. 88).

Elesfeldus(Berkshire)- reversion of a toft and 2 carucates called Elesfeldus in Drayton (CIM 1377-88, pp. 4, 11; CCR 1381-85, p. 105).

"Grant by Alice Pereres, to the king, of all her lands and tenements in Dertford, Wilmyngton, Stone, Southflete, and Merrsh, which he had of the gift of Nicholas de Holbourne, citizen of London" (AD Vol. 3, p. 129; CPR 1370-74, p. 161; CCR 1369-74, p. 344).

Haveryng atte Boure(Essex)- lands late of John de Haveryng, knight (CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Hospicium(London)- an inn and houses close to the gate of the inn (CPR 1377-81, p. 98, 105, 343).

Le Cornerhall(Oxfordshire)- a messuage in Oxford(CFR 1377-83, p. 63).

Le Halle(Surrey)- garden with a dovecote and 3.5 acres of meadow in Bermondesey(CPR 1377-81, pp. 124, 504).

London- "diverse tenements in the City of London, and the reversion of certain tenements there, after the death of Alice, late the wife of Richard de Keselyngbury, citizen of London" (CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Meon Stoke(Hampshire)- all the lands in Meon Stoke(CFR 1377-83, p. 65; CPR 1377-81, pp. 503-4).

Morton(Cumberland)- 'lawn' of Morton and the covert of Mortonscogh (CFR 1356-68, p. 349; CPR 1367-70, p. 183).
Northampton(Northamptonshire)- messuage in Northampton (CFR 1377-83, p. 178; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Oxford- reversion of a tenement in Oxford, late of John Bray(CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Perles(Berkshire)- tenement and a carucate of land caled 'Perles' and a tenement and a carucate of land called Hendys in the town of Drayton (CFR 1377-83, p. 76; CIM 1377-88, pp. 4-5; CPR 1377-81, p. 503).

Saint Eleyne(Berkshire)- lands, rents and services in Abyngdon(CPR 1377-81, p. 503; CCR 1369-74, p. 584, 592).

Saint Boltoph Aldgate(London)- tenement(pays rent)(Hodgett, Gerald A.J. The Cartulary of Holy Trinity Aldgate (London: London Record Society, 1971), pp. 172-174).

Saint Mary-le-Bow(London)- tenement and houses (CCR 1377-81, p. 49).

Sutton(Berkshire)- tenement and 40 acres (CIM 1377-88, pp. 4-5; CCR 1381-85, p. 105).

Thamistrete(London)- messuage or tenement(CPR 1370-74, p. 191).

Toureplace(Northamptonshire)- tenement in Northampton (CPR 1377-81, p. 482).

Whathamptstede(Hertfordshire)- messuage, 100 acres of land, 3 acres of meadow, 3.5 acres of wood and 20s rent in Whathampstede (CFR 1377-83, pp. 80, 198; CIM 1377-88, p. 11).